

# REASON AND RELIGION

OR

THE CERTAIN RVLE OF FAITH

Where the Infallibility of the Roman Catholick Church  
is asserted, against Atheists, Heathens, Iewes,  
Turks, and all Sectaries.

WITH

A REFVTATION OF Mr STILLINGFLEETS

Many gross Errours. By E. W.

*Author of the Book called,*

PROTESTANGY WITHOUT PRINCIPLES

Poteram .... Omnes Propositionum rivulos, tan  
Ecclesie sole siccare. *Hier. contra*

*Lucifer. c. vii. fine.*



PRINTED AT ANTWERP,

By MICHAEL CNOBBART, in the Town

*Permissu Superiorum.*



# REASON AND RELIGION

O R  
THE CERTAIN VALUE OF FAITH  
With the Infallibility of the Roman Catholic Church  
in regard to its spiritual laws,  
and its secular laws.

WITH  
A REVOLUTION OF MR. STURGEON'S  
Many great errors. By E. W.

Author of the Book called  
NOT A STANLEY WITHOUT PRINCIPLES  
For the ... Omnes Propositiones ...  
...  
...  
...



PRINTED AT ANTHEM  
By Michael ...  
...

## PREFACE

TO THE

## READER.

**R**eligion, that choice Evangelical  
 Pearl, *Mark 13*, the best In-  
 heritance and richest Treasure God  
 hath bequeathed to Christians,  
 though sound and strongly guarded,  
 meet's yet with many who long  
 since, had their weak attempts pro-  
 vailed, would have thrown it out of the world. Atheists  
 deny a Deity, the only foundation of Religion, Lawyers oppose  
 Christ, the great Master of Truth, and Hereticks bend  
 against an evidenced universal Church, that large field  
 wherein this precious Jewel is found. These adversaries we  
 encounter, and our design is both to unmask and silence  
 them. In the first place we attack those grosser En-  
 mies, *Atheists, Jews, Turks, and Infidels*. This done, we  
 enter upon the main matter, and friendly treat with an A-  
 dversary

## THE PREFACE

den Secularies by the force of plain and undeniable Principles: If these stand (which none can shake) Protestanty fall's to nothing. I call this Treatise the Rule of Faith, where you have the Inducements, which lead to the knowledge of true Religion clearly proposed, and strongly Maintained against all Opposers, whose cavils and Calumnies repugnant to truth, will appear as they are vain and forceles, after due ponderation of the Principles we rely on.

The prudent search after Religion is ever made and first began with Reason, or a rational discourse, for I hold this Principle indubitable. None can assent to the high revealed Mysteries of Faith, without previous evidence that of their Credibility laid forth to reason. And because Atheists, Arians, and all Heretiques, hold that they teach reasonable, it is necessary to distinguish between false and true Reason, as also rigidly to Examine what ever belongs to that whole Matter, which is amply done in the 14<sup>th</sup>. 15<sup>th</sup>. and, 16<sup>th</sup>. Chapters of the third Discourse, where we prove that Religion is only Reasonable, which Heaven it self declares reasonable, by such visible, sensible, and illustrious Marks we have gained Millions to believe in Christ, and no other but God's Infinite Power and Wisdom, can produce. Hereupon, we lay forth the signal Marks of the Roman Catholick Church, clear Confinances of an Infinite Power and Wisdom, Mi-  
racles

# TO THE READER.

Traces most evident, Conversions of Nations brought by Elders, Succession of Pastors, ever since the Apostles preached, with a Writ unity of one Faith in all that Professed Elder Doctrin. We look next upon this late risen Protestantcy and find it naked, utterly strip'd of all supernatural Monies: No Miracles, no Conversions, no unity in Faith to countenance the Novelty, and therefore conclude that the Professors of it who seemingly stand for Reason, and slight an evidenced Church, are most Unreasonable, and as daily experience teaches, near Scepicks in Matters of Religion.

Clemens Rom. in Recog: D. Petri hereafter cited, gives this wise Counsel to every prudent seeker after Truth. Before all things examin. well by the light of rational Motives; whether one that pretend's to speak in the name of God, and call's himselfe a Prophet sent to preach, proues himselfe to be really so. Thus much learned (and the knowledge is easily gained, because grounded upon evidence) belieue boldly all he teaches, though his Doctrin be sublime, and seem's difficult to weak reason. The first conuerted Christians were thus induced by the Lustre of our Saviours glorious Miracles and other Signal wonders, to own him as he was, a great Prophet, or the true Messias sent from God, and after ward believed what euer Doctrin he taught, vpon his own Infallible word. Apply what is here said to the Roman Catholick Church, you will find this great Truth

## THE PREFACE

*made manifest in the following Discourse viz.* That  
 as no Prophet, no Doctor, ever came near  
 Christ our Lord in the wonders he wrought,  
 so no Society of men since the world stood,  
 was, or is Comparable in Miracles and other  
Cognizances of truth, to the Roman Catholick  
 Church. She as I now said, and no other Society, she was  
 you a Continued Succession of Pastors, of Princes, and Peo-  
 ple since the first Plantation of the Gospel. She and no  
 other, hath been always revered all Nations over, and was  
 never opposed by Orthodox Christians. She gives you a large  
 Catalogue of Innumerable Professors eminent in learning in  
 wisdom, and sanctity of life. In Her the ancient Predictions  
 of Prophets, are literally fulfilled. Her universal extent far  
 and near, is evident; The Conversions wrought by her, Evi-  
 dent. The Courage and Constancy of Martyrs who dyed for  
 her Faith, Evident. Her ancient Possession of truth (for  
 Confessedly she was once Orthodox) is Undeniable, And this  
 is the Church, Gentle Reader, our Sectaries would destroy,  
 This Oracle, though signalized with so many Illustrious  
 Marks, and Indications proceeding from God, in spite of  
 Herden, they invidiously Calumniate as Idolatrous, and He-  
 retical, And consequently make those Millions and Millions,  
 who both living and dying zealously sought to serve no  
 other but the great God of Truth in this blessed Society,

Fools,



## TO THE READER.

Fools, Madmen, Idolaters, and Heretiques. If say Calumniate, for all they have done hitherto, or can do for the future, comes to no more but to a flat inuiurious Calumny, as is euident in the third Discourse. C. 19. where you are told, that whoever impeaches an ancient Church (once acknowledged Orthodox) of Idolatry, and proves not his charge, by clear and undeniable Principles, Calumniates must vniu'ssly, and sin's damnably, Protestants do so, as is there largely proued, and the truth is manifest in their own writings. They tell vs the Roman Catholick Church though once right in Faith, changed Her ancient Doctrin, we iustly urge them to prove the Assertion by some vnquestionable Principles, more conuincing, or of greater weight and strength to perswade what they assert, then the publick judgement of all sound Christians lining at that time, so perswade the Contrary; And Mark a strange Proceeding, the Calumny it self is returned vpon vs, without either Proof or probable Principle to uphold it, but their own bare and proofles word. We are told again, there was ever a Catholick Church without blomis, at least in fundamentals, ( for that Article of the Creed. I believe the Holy Catholick Church was true in all Ages ) We seriously demand where, or in what part of Christendom that Orthodox Church ( distinct from the Roman Catholick ) had its being.

# THE PREFACE

being at that time, when the Roman fell from Christ, and became Idolatrous. There was such a Church which censured and condemned the supposed Roman Errors, or not; If not, the world upon those supposed errors, was wholly dumb. Grant an Orthodox Church distanced from the Roman, She certainly opposed those Imagined false Roman Doctrines, which then began to infect the Moral Body of Christians, and consequently that Opposition was a thing as notoriously known, as loudly noised some Centuries since, as it is Notoriously known and noised, that our Sectaries have now espied those false Doctrines. We urge them to bring to light that publick known Opposition, of their Imagined Church, against the Roman Catholick Society, fancied a Changeling. And what have we? Deep silence from some, and from such as dare speak, false Suppositions for Proofs, and worthy Calumnies for an Answer. Please to see this Argument fully handled. Disc. 2. Cap. 6.

Time was, the world knows well, when our Adversaries avouched they could prove their Protestantcy, and refute our Catholick Doctrin by plain and expresse Scripture, we come to the true Trial in this Treatise, and in lieu of Gods word, find their Books full fraught with meer surferch Glosses. Not one Passage I boldly assert, (and put Sectaries to the Proof) saunders this Protestantcy, as it is distinguished from Popery, and the known Heresies of former



TO THE READER

former Ages. Now that nothing from Scripture can be alleged Contrary to our Catholick Doctrin, is manifest upon this one Principle, which none shall overthrow. What Scripture faithfully interpreted teaches in these weighty matters of Religion, some Orthodox Church delivered in foregoing Ages: For example. If Scripture deny Adoration to Christ in the Blessed Sacrament, or Transubstantiation, an Orthodox Church, which cannot clash with the Verities of God's word, in some Age or other maintained these Protestant Tenets, and published them to Christians, But no Orthodox Church ever sided with Sectaries, or taught such Doctrines, Therefore their pretence to Scripture against our Catholick Tenets is frivolous, and implies no more but a false supposition for a Proof. And this strain of turning bare Suppositions into proofs, which never go beyond the strength of their own vnproved Assertions, so vniuersally transcends all their Polemicks, that I stand astonished, to see men who will be accounted learned, wholly busied in doing Nothing. Reflect I beseech you a little. They haue been told, and I remind them of it again in this Treatise, that whoeuer makes the Roman Church Idolatrous or Erroneous, must hold the supposed Idolatry and error so remedies an Evil, that none on earth can redress either, because all the Proofs or Principles whereby the Reformation should be made, will evidently appear less pon-

## THE PREFACE

devours to Eaince this Church guilty of error, then Her sole Authority is to perswade the Contrary, viz. That she neuer erred. VVherefore Seclaries Confessedly fallible men, desferatly adventure to reform vs, and cannot but spoile all they go about to mend, whilst they Euidence not, whilst they plead not, by the Authority of an Antient Orthodox Church which taught that very Protestancy they teach now, and decryed these Supposed Popish errors as loudly as they decry them: But to do thus much is impossible, as manifestly appears by their own writings, For tell me I beseech you, whoever yet heard Protestant in all those weak skirmishes made against Catholick Religion, Say plainly and prove it. Such a Church reputed Orthodox sine or Six Ages since, taught as we teach, sensed Scriptures as we sense them, Christians then vniuersally believed no Real Presente, No sacrifice of the Masse &c. Has euer Protestant, I say, gon thus groundedly to work? No, Most euidently, No. I shall highly extoll the man that will dare to proceed so ingenuously, but find none engaged in this right way of Arguing. Its true, some who leap over the heads of all their more Immediate Ancestors, between Luther and the three or four first Centuries, tell vs those Primitiue Christians were good Protestants like them. Ill luck Say I that Protestancy had, not to be intailed vpon some Successors in following Ages, for most certainly since those

## TO THE READER.

*those dayes, the world neuer saw Protestant before Luther. In a word the Assertion is a loud vntruth, an vnworthy begging of Question, and besides implies a fancied supposition for a Proof. To show this, we reduce these ranging Spirits to a lesser compass, and oblige them to name but one Protestant, neerer their shameful Revolt from our Catholick Society. Here they stand grauelled, as mute as fishes, and are highly angry, because we touch them where they are most weak.*

*This want of a Church to ground Protestancy vpon, makes their Polemicks to be as they appear, rambling, faint, shallow, and so dissatisfactory, that great patience is requisite to peruse them. Wonder nothing, they can do no better, Rebels they are against an antient Church, and their handling Controuersies may well be compared with the proceeding of Rebels in a Common wealth, who curiously mark, and diligently attend to what euer may seem welcome to your ignorant, seduced, and disgusted Multitudes, That, be it what you will, is fomented, that's laid forth, and inculcated. It is no newes to tell you, that our Ministers in England now for a long time, haue had a number of seduced People bread in their own rebellious bosomes, and brought up in a spirit of Schism, who God knowes haue heard little, but of the Idolatry, of the Superstitious, and wickednes of some Professed Catholicks.*

## THE PREFACE

licks. O, say these Incendiaries, we will nourish this Popular humour with food suitable to its palate, we will write Books of this Popish Idolatry, we haue tongues and can payson with delight, we will lay forth in folio what we conceive of the Roman Superstitions, and the wickednes of Popes. VVe know well to Caul, and how to ensnare the vulgar, on vvhom we depend, when our Cauls are once out, though neither reducible to Principles, nor subiect to the Censure of any Iudge (for we own none) let them shift for themselves. Our only care is to talk on, though we proue nothing, And chiefly to be vvary in one particular, It is neuer to mention any thing of a Church which taught Protestancy before Luther, meddle vvith that Mischieuous difficulty vve are vndon, for really vve haue no such Church. This in a word (and much vvorse) is Protestancy, as is amply declared in the following Treatise, vvhere you also haue the distinctiue Cognisances of Christ's true Church, the Rule of Faith, and the Properties of a Rule explained; vvithall, an easy vvay vvhereby to put an end to these vvnfortunate Controversies. You haue moreover the Infallibility of the Roman Catholick Church asserted, Faith resolued into its true Principles, Mr Stillingfleets grosser Errours discovered, The Reasonableness of Catholick Religion laid forth to enery rational man, And to omit other Questions (all cannot be hinted at

## TO THE READER.

at in the narrow compasse of a Preface) you haue this great Truth proved. *viz.* That if the Roman Catholick Church hath taught but one false Article, and obliged all Christians to belieue it vnder pain of damnation, there neither is at this day, nor was before Luther any true faith in the world. Wherefore Sectaries who haue made it their chiefe busines to impeach our Church of Idolatry, and Heresy (and the louder they cryed, the more they thought to destroy vs) haue done their utmost to ruin all the Churches on earth, and proue themselues thereby both Faithles and Churchles. But enough for a Preface. Open and read. Approoue or condemn, as reason shall guide you. In case you Condemn, please to say, Why, and shew me where I erre in Principles. Pardon the faults of the Printer which are many (he is a stranger to our Language) except against mine boldly, if you find any, but do it with Charity, and still, for this I must inculcate again and again, Remember Principles.

Farewel.

A N  
ADVERTISEMENT  
FOR  
Mr STILLINGFLEET

Sr.

**H**erein dealing is the best, you shall haue it in this short Advertisement from a friendly Adversary (no Enemy I assure you) who desires to do you good, against your will. If I be rightly informed, Both you and some others find your selves dissatisfied vpon this score, that your Rational Account (as tis called) comprehending the Grounds of Protestant Religion, remain's yet vntouch't, or not answered. Before I reply to these complaints, I shall take the boldnes to request one fauour at your hands (you will much oblige me by it) which is to point out that Chapter or Paragraph through your whole Book, wherein the hidden treasure of these Protestants Grounds lie, and to giue me in a few lines, one or two of them plainly set down in halfe a Sheet of paper. I speak of Grounds for Protestancy, as it is your peculiar Religion distinct from Popery, and all known Condemned Hereties. Fob me not off, I beseech you, with any general talk, Tell me not I must seek better and shall find, For, Sr, I assure you though I haue made a diligent Search after your Grounds, they are yet so far removed from my sight, that I cannot find one. Wherefore,



## AN ADVERTISEMENT

fore, because you are more Conuersant in your own writings then others, and, *Plus vident oculi quam oculus*, I beg to be enlightnied by you. If you fail to do this, the world will iudge as I do, that you haue abused the Reader with à Title, wherevnto nothing in your voluminous Book answer's. I mean you haue no more touched vpon Grounds for Protestancy ( as Protestancy and mark my words) then for Arianism, or any other false Religion.

In the perusal of your Book I se what beguiled you. You, Sr, thought to throw that little dirt ( wherewith some haue furnished you ) in our faces, was enough to make your bad cause Specious, and to prop vp your Protestancy, as if forsooth to Cavil at vs, were to establish your Novelties. Know good Sr, that both Arians and all other gone Heretiques, were as fierce in their Caults against the Church as you are, but did they therefore either ground or establish their false Doctrins contrary to Gods Truths? It is à gross error to think so; For as it is one thing foolishly to brandish à Sword, and another fitly to vse à Buckler, so it is à quite different busines slightly to impugn Catholick Religion, and another to defend Protestancy. The first you haue attempted like your old Heretiques, and with as ill success; But the second, which is to maintain Protestancy, or to settle that vpon solid Grounds, neither is, nor was, nor euer shall be done by any, wherefore I tell you in this Treatise ( read it if you please ) This Protestancy is wholly vngrounded, God never revealed one Article of it ( as Protestancy ) nor did ever antient or modern Orthodox Church teach so much as one of your *Particular Tenets*,



## FOR MR STILLINGFLEET

*Tenets*, And for this reason I say, its falsely called the *reformed Religion*, having neither Essence, nor the Properties of Religion belonging to it.

Now for as much as Concern's your Clamours, because you think your Book neglected, or not yet Answered. First, give me leave to tell you, it is a great Vanity to rise to so high a conceipt of your selfe or of your Book (as if you were the only Defender of your Faith) and a greater to publish it to the world. what think you, Cannot Protestancy be impugned without taking you or your work in hand? Its little wisdom to iudge so. A Souldier, good Sir, who intend's to inuade an enemy takes no directions from him, how to enter his Country, much less busies his thoughts about remouingeuery straw, or euery little block that lies in his way, but marches on, as he thinks best to compass his Design. To ouerthrow your Protestancy is our Design, and you most vnreasonably prescribe, what we are to do, That is, we must either attaque your *Fort* and meddle with your *Account*, or you think nothing is done. Why so I beseech you? Grant, which is not true, that those who haue written since your Account saw light, passed by it without much notice, they might well do so, looking on it as a Block not worth remouing, vnless, as I say, you will haue them to obey your Commands, and assault what Ourwork you please. *It is Sr, your Cause* *de more mind, then your Account.* 2. Why do you (or some body for you) not only shamefully stopp all the Presses, in so much that scarce a sheet of paper can appear in publick; But moreover, why haue you (when all liberty is granted to scribe and print what you please) omitted to

Answer

## AN ADVERTISEMENT

Answer those Bookes, which directly impugn your Doctrin. That excellent Guide of controversies is the One, and Protestancy without Principles, the other: And you have done this with much uncivil scornful Language, with a meer forced Pish from the teeth outward at the end of a Preface, as if, forsooth, you would be thought to Say; *You could answer but will not; whereas the naked truth is* (at least wise men Iudge so) *you would answer but, Cannot.* Sr, believe me, it would have been much to the purpose, and far more satisfactory to your Protestant Brethren, had you, when you saw your Protestancy (to speak moderately) well shaken in those two Books, replied to some particulars, and shewed where either the Principles were false, or their Discourses failed, But you Cowardly quitted the field, sat down silent, busying your selfe with reprinting a few Sermons, whereof the world had no need at all. And this (t'is thought) was done to cloak your Lazines, your ignorance or both, because you could not Answer, yet we are called on to quarrel with you, whilst you like a Priuiledged Person exempt your selfe from meddling with vs. That is we must speak, and you say nothing.

But, Sr, let vs come neerer the point and tell you truth. Whatever you account substantial in your Book, hath been answered by your two scorned Aduersaries, and if any thing be yet wanting, it is amply supplied in this Treatise. To conceiue what I would proue, please to Note. There are two wayes in answering a Booke. The one is to follow an Author step after step, by examining severally each piece of the Whole: The other is to Consider the Principles whereupon the Whole relies,

FOR MR STILLINGFLEET.

lyes, shewing them either false in themselves, or not connex't with those Conclusions which should follow from them. *Destroy Principles, you destroy all.* Thus the Motion of a Watch may be spoiled two wayes, either by disordering every wheel in it, à part, or by breaking the Spring. The fairest Palace ever was, is ruine'd, if either you separate every stone from stone, or if you vndermine the foundation and blow vp the whole Fabrick, though many of the stones strongly Cimented, cling yet together. The first way of answering by piece-meal, is tedious and obscure, and as things are with vs (by reason of the difficulty in Printing and transmitting Bookes into England) almost impossible, The other is clear and easy, both are satisfactory to every rational man, and I hold the second most necessary, For, in all our Discourses there must be some firm Principles laid wherevnto we reduce, and from whence we draw what we Assert, which several wayes of discoursing, Compose the two different Methods, *Analytical and Synhetical*, obserued by Philosophers and Divines. Neither is the Foundation more necessary to à house, or the weight to a clock, then Principles are to a Discourse, which then is good, when the grounds stand firm, and the Deductions of the particular Conclusion from them, *clear*: But if either the Principles be false and alien, or the Deductions not Coherent, the whole Discourse fall's to nothing.

Apply what is here sayd to your Account, or rather to the Religion it Asserts, and you have all I would Say. Your Account, Sr, was writ to vindicate Protestancy, and must stand vpon the same Principles with that Nouelty, therefore whatever shak's and ruin's the Principles of  
Pro-

## AN ADVERTISEMENT.

Protestancy, necessarily shak's, and ruin's the Principles of your Account, But your Supposed Principles or Grounds of Protestancy are broken, yea demonstrated no Grounds at all, in the Book intitl'd *Protestancy without Principles*, where they are proued either false, or no Principles peculiar to your Religion, as it is distinct from the Doctrin of other Societies, called *Non-Protestants*, And consequently when true, they haue no Connexion with Protestancy, nor can lead in any conclusion for you, And where they are false, their falsity is laid before your eyes, and an vtter subuersion of your Cause, and Account with it, because neither can stand, when your supposed Principles are destroyed, or rather found never to have had Being. And thus your Book is solidly Answered. If you desire to se more ruin yet fallen vpon you, read this Treatise, and be pleased to reflect vpon these three things in your Account. The *length of it*, The *Obiections against Catholick Religion*, and finally your Principles for Protestancy. We find two of them, but miss the third. The length mighty tedious, and (too often without substance) wearies a Reader, God help him (say I) that vndergoes the druggery to turn over all the vneuen stuff which lies heap't vp there. Your Obiections, vsually borrowed from Mr Chillingworth and some other Protestant Writers, are for the most part common, and such as haue been answered ouer and ouer: Where you think them peculiar to your selfe (as they lay in my way) I haue reioyned, and if some be omitted, that's only to Say, euery stone in your Fabrick is not touched, or medled with, But for as much as concerns your Principles in behalfe of Protestancy, I As-

## FOR Mr STILLINGFLEET.

sert Confidently, you haue none, and vpon this ground;  
I say once more your Account is answered.

Goë on therefore, and vilify the works published  
against you as you please, call them *Wool sacks*, *Rats*, or  
*Flies*, add more opprobrious language to gain you credit  
among your simple and too credulous Vulgar, with In-  
telligent Readers you preuail nothing, who well percei-  
ue, it Matters not to your Intent, if those *Wool-sacks* re-  
ceiue and break the force of your greatest shot against  
our Church; if the *Rats* gnaw the best ligaments wo-  
uen in your Account, if but one of these flies enter your  
throat, and bereaue you of breath (some report of à  
great man stifled by à Fly) And truly it seem's by your  
deep silence, or not answering since these Books came  
forth, that some of the greater sort haue halfe chok'd  
you. *But enough.* To say more after this strain, were to  
rallie like you, and to offend the learned world, which  
requires substance in these sesious matters, without  
contempt, flowting, and empty words. Had you, Sr,  
gone the right way to work, you should either haue  
kept in your disdainful language, or taken *Protestancy*  
*without Principles in hand*, Shewing, where the Author  
mistook your Principles, Or whether his exceptions  
were blamable, because he thought them either Com-  
mon, and not belonging to you, *that is*, wholly alien  
from your cause, wholly impertinent to Maintain Pro-  
testancy. This proceeding had been Satisfactory, but  
difficuk and aboue your force, Therefore you wisely  
waued it, knowing well it was easier to giue sharp  
words, and snarle at your Aduersaries, than to come neer  
and bite, with pinching Arguments.

My

## AN ADVERTISEMENT

My proceeding with you, Sr. is quite contrary, I slight nor your person, but say plainly where your great mistake lies in handling Controversies. You run headlong into the deep Mysteries of Faith by the ill conduct of your weak, or not well sighted reason, and after a few stagg ring thoughts spent in weighing, and musing vpon the difficulties, which appear to you in the Mysteries, you will needs tell vs what's true, what's false, and therefore boldly take, and reiect, as you like best. It is a perplexed way, Sr, which will neuer make, you either Good Christian, good Diuine, or so much as a mean Proficient in Christ's School. In following it, you are just like one ( as I tell you in the Treatise ) that takes wholsome Pills into his Mouth, chews them, find's them bitter, and spitt's all out. Hence it is, you spit at the Doctrins of Transubstantiation, of Purgatory &c. because forsooth, they are distastful to sense and shallow reason. And truly, Sr, it is wonderful, that you haue not long since by this procedure, cast off the Doctrin of the sacred Trinity, For most certainly might sense and weak reason plead the Cause here, far greater difficulties would occur against that sublime Mystery, then euer Protestants yet proposed against our other Catholick Tenents. In a word, Sr, if you desire satisfaction in matters of Religion, busy not your head with the examination of the Diuine Mysteries *Considered in themselves*, they are aboue your reach, but contrarywise, consider well, how, and by what means they are made *Credible* to reason, which is done as S. Austin, cited afterward, tell's you, by first finding out that clear marked, and signalized Church, whereby God speaks, This



FOR MR. STILLINGFLEET.

Oracle once discover'd (and the Discovery grounded  
upon Evidence, is easy) *Hear and Believe Her*; She is wis-  
ser then you, and never think to shake so strong a For-  
tress, by devising petty Arguments against Her Doctrin  
(no sooner seen then solved) because, forsooth, you can-  
not Comprehend it.

But it is high time to end and I shall do so, with one  
word more of good advice. Fooles they say may some-  
times give a wise man Counsel. Sr, if you intend to  
write any more, Consider for your own sake, what you  
write, weigh things well in your thoughts, before they  
pass your pen. Have alwaies this one reflexion in  
mind. *Its easy to Cunnil, easy to talk much*, but most labori-  
ous to make sure what you say; by sound Principles,  
And Principles your Aduersaries euer have an Eye to.  
Had you complied with this Advice, the greatest part  
of your Account (if not all) might well have been spar-  
red. Never rely on the vain prayses of your vulgar  
Readers, all is not gold that glisters in their Eyes, nor  
do they alwayes speak as they think. For as much as  
concern's your selfe, shew, sr, rather the strength of a  
Father in louing your works, then the weaknes of a  
fond Mother that hugs her Brats, though most defor-  
med. I am told, you imagin it a great Accchieuement,  
and your selfe the conquerour, in hauing gain'd one pri-  
uate man T. C. to follow your triumphant Chariot,  
Abuse not your Iudgement there is no such matter, for  
in good sober earnest by what I have perused in T. C.  
*his book rather seem's to be an answer to yours, then yours to his.*  
Abstain hereafter from opprobrious Language, lest you  
meet with some ruffling Adversary that will pay you in  
your



## AN ADVERTISEMENT

your own Coyn. Please to use your Buckler better in behalfe of Protestancy, and tell me when your Negatiue Articles are thrown away (*as not reuealed*) *what essential Truth remain's vvithin the Compassse of Protestancy, reuealed by Almighty God, and necessary to Salvation.* If you think it the wisest Course, not to take notice of what is proposed against you in this Treatise, vouchsafe to clear your selfe of the Contradictions charged vpon you. And because I find you much intangled in your Resolution of Faith, and haue laid your mistakes open to publick view; when the Spirit of answering fall's vpon you again, Answer I beseech you, to the difficulties Obiected in the third Discourse, But about all Answer to God with a hearty repentance, for the wrong you haue done his Church, and own me.

Sr

*Your friendly Adversary,*

THE

THE  
CHAPTERS  
IN ORDER.  
THE RVLE OF FAITH

Wherein the infallibility of the Roman Catho-  
lick Religion is established against Atheists,  
Heathens, lewes, Turks, and  
all Sectaries.

CHAP. I. *Whether true Religion be in the world? The Affirmative proved Against Atheists. Atheism, evidently Shew'd improbable.* 1

CHAP. II. *Reason rejects all sects or Religions not Christian. Whether Gentilism, Induism; or Turkism, be erroneous and improbable?* 13

CHAP. III. *Christianity as it stands in opposition to lewes, Turks, Infidels and Hereticks, is the only true Religion.* 21

CHAP. IV. *Whether Christian Religion since its first Propagation hath not been in like manner preserved pure, and further spread by Divine Providence, above the Power of Nature?* 25

CHAP. V. *Whether all called Christians Believe intirely Christ's sacred Doctrin? And whether means be afforded to arrive to the knowledge of true Christian Religion?* 29

CHAP. VI. *Of our Sectaries error in their search after true Religion.*

THE CHAPTERS IN ORDER.

Religion. As also of Mr Stillingfleets inconsequent way of Arguing. 32

CHAP. V H. More of this subiect. Doubts concerning the several editions of scripture. None extant more pure, then the Vulgar Latin. Abstract from Church Authority, there is no Certainty of the best Edition. Sectaries Comparing the Present Copies with the more ancient gives no assurance. A word with Mr Stillingfleets. 42

CHAP. VIII. How necessary it was to have one lection of Scripture in the Church. A word of the Sixtine and Clementine Bibles. Of Mr Stillingfleets mistakes and inconsequences concerning them. Objections answered. 55

CHAP. IX. Proofs demonstrasing that Protestants have not so much certainty of Scripture, as excludes a possibility of reasonable doubting. A word of Mr Stillingfleets weak discourse with a Heathen. 67

A Discourse between a Heathen and a Christian. 71

CHAP. X. The first and easiest way to find out true Religion is not by Scripture only, though all Christians had moral certainty of the right Canon, and sense also, which is to say, the meer owning Christs Doctrin, is insufficient to proue it, to all sort of People. 80

CHAP. XI. The Protestant takes away the only means to know true Religion by. His proofs, whether He defend's Protestancy or impugn's Catholick Doctrin, are irreducible to Principles, and neuer goe beyond the weaknes of his own unproved Assertion. Meer glosses support all He saith, which is evidenced by a brief handling one Controuersy, touching the B. Sacrament. Theodores wrong'd by Sectaries, cleared. His Doctrin is most Catholick. 85

Theodores Testimony alleged above, Contains most Catholick Doctrin. 94

Chap.

THE CHAPTERS IN ORDER

- CHAP. XII. A Digression concerning the Real Presence: The  
Fathers plainly assert it, Sectaries glosses frivolous. The agree-  
ment of the Church and Fathers make a Doctrine indubitable.  
The Catholicks certain Principle. A word with Mr Scilling-  
fleet. 102
- CHAP. XIII. Mr Scillingfleet grossly abuses the Fathers that  
assert the Real Presence. His unprincipled glosses are not only  
dubious, and therefore worth nothing, but moreover highly im-  
probable. 119
- CHAP. XIV. It is further proved that neither Scripture alone,  
nor any other Principle distinct from an erring Church,  
can with certainty decide Controversies in Matters of Religion,  
or Regulate Christian Faith. 138
- CHAP. XV. The other mentioned Principles above, are insufficient  
to decide controversies, Or to Regulate faith. 152
- CHAP. XVI. One word more of Mr Scillingfleets Glosses, and  
his unexcusable abuse of other Fathers. 159
- CHAP. XVII. Why the Glosses of Sectaries are impertinent  
and needless? Mr Scillingfleet misinterprets other Fathers.  
Of his unskillful Speculation concerning Idolatry charged on  
Catholicks. 179
- CHAP. XVIII. The Protestant after all his Glosses can not  
ascertain any, of true Religion. He would make Controversies  
an endless work. 180
- CHAP. XIX. The last designe of Sectaries Glosses discovered.  
They end nothing. The clear way to end Controversies of Re-  
ligion. A distinction between Authority and Principled Au-  
thority. Of the improbability of Protestantcy. 192
- CHAP. XX. A word to one or two Objections. It is further  
proved, That Controversies are ended with Protestants, who  
have no Essence of Religion, but false opinions only. 205
- CHAP. XXI. Protestants granting Salvation to Catholicks by a  
clear

THE CHAPTERS IN ORDER.

clear Inference drawn from their Concession, and Controversies of Religion. *What force their concession hath. Why they granted so much. The Argument is clearly proposed. Mr Stillingfleet return's no probable Answer. A full discovery of his fallacies.* 217

THE  
SECOND DISCOURSE,  
OF

The Church and Rule of Faith

CHAP. I. *Necessary Principles premised relating to the Controversy now in hand, concerning the true Church And Rule of Faith.* 241

CHAP. II. *The Rule of Faith assigned: The properties of a Rule. What is meant by the Church? Ancient Fathers Assert that the Church is easily found out. Her marks, more clear, than Her Essential Doctrin.* 248

CHAP. III. *The Protestant has neither Church evidenced by Marks of Truth, nor true Doctrin made credible to reason. His whole Faith is built upon Fancy.* 256

CHAP. IV. *The one and only true Church of Christ, was, is, and shall ever be the Holy, Apostolical, and Catholick Roman Church. Her Antiquity and Constant Perseverance in the Ancient primitive Doctrin, without Alteration, prove The Assertion.* 266

CHAP. V. *A second Reason showing, That if the Roman Catholick Church erred but in one Article of Faith, there is now*

THE CHAPTERS IN ORDER.

- no Fundamental Faith in the world, *Where Error in this Church, it is a remediless Evil, and cannot be amended by any, least of all by Protestants.* 276
- CHAP. VI. Other Evidences of the Roman Churches Perseverance in the Primitive Faith, without change or Alteration, *Whether wickednes of life necessarily induceth Error into the Church? The Donatists and Protestants Argue, and Err alike.* 285
- CHAP. VII. Manifest and most undeniable Miracles peculiar to the Roman Catholick Church only, prove Her Orthodox, *will show that She still retain's the Primitive Doctrine.* 296
- CHAP. VIII. Miracles evident in the Roman Catholick Church, *Not less induce All now to believe Her Doctrine, Than Apostolical Miracles Anciently Perswaded to believe that Primitive Doctrine. The Denial of Miracles Impossibilizes The Conversion of Iewes and Infidels.* 302
- The Admirable cure wrought by Blessed S. Xaverius in the Famous Citty of Naples, upon a worthy Religious Person called F. Marcellus Mastrilli, a Noble man by birth, and by Profession of the Society of Iesus. The Proof hinted at above, reassumed.* 312
- CHAP. IX. A word to a few Objections, as also to Mr Stillingfleets unworthy Exceptions against that evident Miracle wrought at Zaragoza in Spain, 321
- CHAP. X. Other Marks and Signs peculiar to the Roman Catholick Church prove her Orthodox, And make Her Doctrine evidently credible. These laid forth to Sense and Reason, distinguish the true Church from all Erring Societies. Inferences drawn from the Doctrine Here delivered. 333
- Chap,



THE CHAPTERS IN ORDER

CHAP. XI. *Christ and his Church made manifest to à Heathen. No Prophet comparable to Christ, no Church comparable to the Roman Catholick. Our glorious Christ Iesus Exhibits à glorious Church. He is proved the Only true Messias, And the Roman Catholick Church His only true Spouse. How the Heathen Discomfesse, if rational, And Prudent.* 349

CHAP. XII. *The Adversaries of the Roman Catholick Church plead unreasonably. A Discovery of their fallacies. The cause of all Errour, concerning Religion. The only means to remedy Errour.* 353

*Arguments drawn from what is said. Reflections made upon the premised Doctrin.* 377

CHAP. XIII. *Other Inferences drawn from the precedent Doctrin. Atheists and Hereticks Argue alike. The Motives of Credibility lead to à total Belief of what ever the true Church Proposes. A word of Mr Thorndicks Mistakes concerning the Church.* 181

*A Word of Mr Thorndicks Mistakes discovered in His Book of Forbearance.* 387

CHAP. XIV. *Whether there be à Church of one Denomination infallible, not only in Matters miscalled Fundamental, but in all and every Doctrin She Proposes, and Obliges Christians to believe, as Faith?*

CHAP. XV. *Divine Faith in this present State of things, necessarily requir's à Church infallible. The Reason hereof. The Church neither Defin's, nor can Define by Humane Authority only. Her Definitions, more than morally certain, are Infallible. Sectaries Recourse to Moral certainly in Matters of Faith, à most frigid Plea. Their Fallacy is discovered. Objections Answered.* 408

Order



THE CHAPTERS IN ORDER.

Other Objections proposed by Seditaries, Solved, More of Moral certainty. 419

CHAP. XVI. Principles promised to the following Doctrin. The Roman Catholick Church is a Church of One Denomination. She, and no other Society of Christians, is Infallible. Other Grounds of Her Infallibility laid forth. The Infallibility of Councils maintained against Mr Stillingfleets Supposed Truth and Reason. There are no principles whereby Approved Councils can be proved fallible. Seditaries Convinced by their own Doctrin. 423

CHAP. XVII. More of this subject, A further Search made into Errors called intolerable. Whether the Roman Catholick Church must be supposed by Seditaries to have already Committed intolerable Errors, Or only, whether She may for the future Err Intolerably? The Doctrin of Protestants proved False, And most inconsequent. 443

CHAP. XVIII. Two Adversaries mainly Opposit to True Religion. The last and most urgent Proof of the Churches Infallibility taken from the Necessity, the Nasion and Nature of true Religion. Mr Stillingfleets Objections found weak and Weighles. Most of them already Proposed and Dissolved by others. A short Reflection made upon some few. 452

CHAP. XIX. Certain Principles, where upon the Churches Infallibility stand's firm. The End of Divine Revelation is to teach all Infallibly. Every Doctrin revealed by the fast Verity is no less infallible, then true. Its one thing to teach Truth, another to teach Divine and Infallible Truth. Seditaries Strangely ungrateful. A word of Mr Stillingfleets weak Objections. 465

# THE THIRD DISCOURSE OF

## The Resolution of Faith:

**C**HAP. I. Some chief Contents in this Discourse briefly declared. Mr Stillingfleets weak attempts against the Churches infallibility and the Resolution of Faith. The Catholick way of resolving Faith, the very same with that of the Primitive Christians. Of the mistakes which run through Mr Stillingfleets whole Discourse. 477

CHAP. II. Mr Stillingfleets 5.<sup>th</sup> Chapter. Part. 1. examined, is found *VV*rightles. The weaknes of his Arguments discovered. His First and chiefest Argument restored and solved. 483

CHAP. II 1. More of this subiect. Objections Answered. A word to Mr Stillingfleets forceless Instances. Motives of credibility ever Precede Faith. *VV*hether the rational Evidence of the Truth of Christ's Doctrine, can be a Motive to believe it. 493

CHAP. IV. More of Mr Stillingfleets Errors. Of that odd kind of Faith he seems to maintain, grounded on Moral Certainty. *VV*hat Influence the Motives of Credibility have upon Faith? Other Parcels of his Doctrine Examined, and refused. Objections Solved. 505

CHAP. V. More quarrels Answered. Mr Stillingfleets endeavour to catch Catholicks in a Circle, demonstrated both vain and

THE CHAPTERS IN ORDER.

and improbable. His Objections are forceless. A word to an  
unlearned Cautel. 516

CHAP. VI. Mr Stillingfleet solves not His Adversaries Argu-  
ment: A word of his seditious Shuffling. The Motives of Cra-  
dibility both distinguish the Church from all other Hetero-  
dox Communities, and prove Her Infallible. The Agreement  
with the Primary Doctrin, no Mark of the Church. More  
Mistakes and Errors discovered. Of Mr Stillingfleets dou-  
ble Faith who Believes, but not upon Divine the Testimony,  
That the Books of Scripture contain Gods word in them:  
Yet Believes the Doctrin in those books, to be Divine. 523

Whether we Square Circles in our Resolution of Faith. The  
other mentioned Points in the Tittle of the Chapter, discussed.  
Upon what ground those Articles called the fundamentals of  
Faith are believed, in the Opinion of Sectaries. 534

CHAP. VII. Necessary Principles premised to the Resolution of  
Faith. God can Speak in a Language proper to Himself.  
His external language is twofold. When God speaks not  
immediatly, He must be heard by his Oracle. What the  
exact Resolution of Faith implies? 545

CHAP. VIII. The main Difficulty in the Resolution of Faith,  
Proposed. What Connexion the Motives have with the Di-  
vine Revelation? Of their weight and efficacy. Gods own  
Language not imitable by his Enemies. Faith transcends the  
certainty of all Motives, The main Difficulty solved. Of our  
great Security in Believing God, Though we have not Evi-  
dence of the Divine Testimony.

CHAP. IX. the whole Progress of Faith Explained in order  
to its last Resolution. Of that which the Fathers Call the  
light of Faith. Its wholly different from Sectaries Private  
Spirit. From whence Faith hath Infallible Certainty.  
Obiec.

## Objections Solved.

360

CHAP. X. The easiest way of resolving Faith, Laid forth in two Propositions. The evidence of Credibility further declared. Sectaries have no Evidence of Credibility. It is as evidently Credible that God now speak's by the Church, as that He did anciently Speak by the Prophets.

370

CHAP. XI. Sectaries Objections solved. The fallible Agreement of all Concerning the Canon of Scripture, no Proof at all. No universal Consent for the Sectaries Scripture, or the Sense of it. How the Church is both the Verity believed, and the Motive, why we believe. Other Difficulties Examined.

380

CHAP. XII. The last Objection Proposed. Whether the Churches Testimony may be called the Formal Object of Faith. Other Notes and Considerations, Concerning The Resolution of Faith.

388

CHAP. XIII. Protestants have no Faith to resolve, And upon that account are freed from a vicious Circle. Some yet are in a Circle. Two Sorts of Sectaries refused.

396

CHAP. XIV. The Mistakes of some Sectaries in this Controversy. Its necessary to distinguish between true Reason, and fallacious Reasoning. Private Reason liable to Errour. Principles presupposed to the Decision of this Question. Reason easily finds out true Religion, by a rational Evidence previous to Faith.

603

CHAP. XV. From whence the Evidence hitherto mentioned Proceed's? That Religion only is reasonable, which Heaven declares reasonable. The Declaration is evidently made in behalfe of the Roman Catholick Religion. Who is the misled reasoning Man? Other Particulars handled. The readiest way to Convince Sectaries.

615

CHAP. XVI. Objections solved. Sectaries pretending not to See the Churches Evidence, are either blind, or wilfully shut their Eyes.

Eyes.

THE CHAPTERS IN ORDER.

Eyes. The Assertion clearly proved. A Parallel of the Primitive, and the present Churches Evidence. How far Reason may be sayd to Regulate Faith. 625

CHAP. XVII. A Digression Concerning Doctor Stillingfleets Discourse, Where he treat's of the Protestants Faith reduced to Principles. He is all a long quite besides the matter handled, and Sayes no more for Protestancy, than for Arminism, or any other Heresi. 639

CHAP. XVIII. The Doctors Inferences, proued no Inferences, but untrue Assertions. Having answer'd his Principles and Inferences, Satisfaction is required to some few Questions proposed. 652

CHAP. XIX. The supposed grounds of our Protestants Reformation manifestly overthrown. Protestancy no Religion but an improbable Novelty. The conclusion of this whole Treatise. 665

## COVRTEOUS READER.

**Y**ou will soon perceiue .by the many literal faults in this Treatise, that I stranger to our language printed it, and that the Corrector vsed not diligence. Such errata as these are ( have for haue. Spouse for Spouse, Proslyte for Proselyte. Suspence for Suspence, Symtons for Symptons, Citty for Citie Christians for Christians. Chursh for Church wich for which, hanfom for handsome Religion, for Religion must for most, with many more like them) I leaue to your charitable Correction,

### Some greater faults are here noted.

**P** Age. 2. For ciuillized. Read ciuiliſ'd. line 22. read an vniversal. Page. 3. l. 33. r. voluntarily. P. 4. l. 22. for nonne. r. none. p. 5. l. 14. r. strictly. p. 10. l. 3. r. Crimes. l. 21. r. then. and l. 27. for vhem. r. when. Synogogue, for Synagogue, Cod for God, hypoericy, for hypocrisy. distinguished for distinguished, and the like Errata following I omit. P. 12. in the Title. By reasonable. r. by reason. P. 18. l. 31. r. n. bath. p. 20. l. 19 For Elisi. r. Eisi, and l. 13. r. Alcoran. p. 35. l. 5. dele. the. p. 36. l. 5. r. Concern. and l. 23. r. Churches care. p. 58. l. 31. r. perfected. p. 61. l. 23. r. *memoriam* p. 72 l. 10. r. meaning. p. 101. l. 21. r. haue it. p. 104. l. 26. r. full. p. 107. l. 21. r. Innumerable. p. 126. l. 2. r. saying. l. 6. r. reply, and l. 23. r. Fathers. p. 123. l. 29. r. Mali. p. 129. l. 32. r. *Idem*. p. 144. l. 6. r. is it p. 161. l. 15. r. Say I is it. p. 164. l. 1. r. Romanos and l. 2. r. whose Faith. p. 167. l. 3. r. desperate. p. 173. l. 4. dele. p. 174. l. 20. r. Speculation. p. 179. l. 2. r. Apotheoses, and l. 26. r. scuse, and l. 26. dele. a. p. 185 r. gleanings. p. 187. l. 4. r. suspence. p. 189. l. 20. r. decides. p. 191. l. 23 r. obsolete. p. 190. in Titulo. r. ascertain. p. 199. l. 15. r. guesses. p. 200. l. 2. r. standing. and in the Tittler. way. p. 214. l. 7. r. Title. and l. 36 r. discourse: p. 224 l. 9. r. Solution. p. 228. in marg. r. Concession. p. 232. l. 3. r. Mals in the Church, and l. 4. dele the word Church. p. 236. l. 3. read for very the name. p. 239. l. 3. r. pen to paper. p. 236. l. 23. r. hinted at. p. 266. lin. vlt. r. Euident. p. 275. in Marg. r. vnanswerable. p. 276. in the Title of the Chapter. r. world. p. 335. l. 22. r. Christ's kingdom. p. 341. l. 8. dele the. p. 343. l. 25. r. Apostasy. Afterwards you haue Deuide for diuide, Mosias for Messias. Apostacy for Apostasy. Fabrik for Fabrick. Sensuallity for sensuality, Exceptor for Acceptor. Legardemain for leger. peccadillo for peccadillo Cherubins for Cherubims. Seraphins for Seraphims. Numberles for numberless. Nauatiani for Nouatiani. Commissioned for Commissioned. Teit's for teit's banding for bandying, yets for yet. rhus for thus. Chimera for Chimera p. 369. l. 5. r. blaspheme and Contemn Parall'd for parallel'd. p. 390. l. 21. dele which. you haue moreover. ranked for ranked. Phisitians for Physitians. phisick for physick. bountiffully for bountifully. aparition for apparition. limited for limited, lewish for lewish. traitorously for traitorously. Afterward for afterwards. vpward for upwards. Acquise for



# Errata.

for acquiesce. All plain Errata and easily corrected. p. 504. l. 21. for believe.  
r. believe. p. 510. l. 17. r. without so, p. 511. l. 16. for there. r. three. p. 526.  
l. 4. dele comma. There are yet many, and very many faults in Orthography  
and interpunctions vncorrected, courteous Reader as you goe along, vouchsafe  
to correct them with your pen.

Disc. 2. after p. 353. please to correct the Errour in the next Page, and  
read p. 354. p. 341. l. 3. dele the. p. 373. in the Title. Chap. 13. And p. 481.  
in the Title for. 19. r. Chap. 1. p. 516. in the Title of the Chap. r. vale-  
arned. p. 677. l. for thy r. this. and in the Aduertisement p. 7. l. 24 r. Achieue-  
ment, in the Preface. P. 9. l. 17. r. transend's.



THE  
FIRST DISCOVERSE,

*Of true Religion.*

**T**O attaine à clear knowledge of true Christian Religion is the chiefe Design of this whole Treatise. VVe are therefore in the first place, to discusse matters seriously with Christ's professed Enemies, and to prove that the propagation of our Sauours sacred Doctrin, hath been à Diuine vvork aboute the force of nature. Thus much performed, vve Shevv hovv Sectaries erre in their Search after Religion, and euince that it is not found by their priuate pondering Scripture alone, much lesse by any vnprincip'l'd Glosses. Lastly, in this Discourse, vve lay forth an easy vvay, vvhereby all these vnfortunate Debates concerning Religion, may come to à happy period. The

# THE RULE OF FAITH,

Wherin the infallibility of the Roman Catholick Religion is established against Atheists Heathens, Iewes, Turks, and all Sectaries.

## CHAP. I.

*Whether true Religion be in the world? The Affirmative proved Against Atheists. Atheism, evidently Shew'd improbable.*

1. **T**He question may perhaps seem doubtful to many, upon these grounds. First. Who euer admit's of Religion must either hold it true upon the Authority of others, or because he is perswaded it can be found out by his own search and industry. If he relies on Authority, He meet's with as many Pretenders to truth as there are different Professors of Religions on earth. The Jew pleads for his as the most ancient, the Christian for his, the Turk for his, the Heathen for following the light of nature, and every one thinks well of his own way, and votes his own Religion best. If therefore à searcher after truth relies on Authority, He can no more (say these) take the Christians word than the Heathens, the Heathens then the Jewes, the Jewes then the Turks, the Arians then the Catholicks, the Catholicks than the Protestants, and Consequently ought in prudence to reject all Religion. *Different judgements Concerning true Religion*  
*The most of men pretend to it.*

2. On the other side, if He chuse à Religion by the force of his private judgement only, or own industry, He is cast into à Labyrinth and shall never find an *exit*. He is obliged in prudence to make à diligent search into all the different Sects which are, or have bin since the first creation of things: He is carefully to examin

A

examin

*The difficultly about the choise.*

examin the causes of them, the grounds they rely on, the connexion or coherence they have with one another; He is to converse with the learned of these different Religions, or read their books, and then to pitch by his own erring judgement on what likes him best, which perhaps may be worst of all. This task you see is immense and no lesse unsuccessful than laborious, mans life is spent, before halfe the work be done. Therefore it seems, none can come to the certain knowledge of true Religion either by Authority or reason. *Ergo*, saith the Opponent, there is no such thing as true Religion in Being.

*True Religion is in being. The reason of the Assertion.*

3. Contrariwise I say. True Religion most evidently is in the world. The Assertion is grounded on this certain verity: God eternally existing by himself without cause, and infinite in all perfection is in Being; therefore true Religion cannot but bee also. For Grant such a *Being* as God is, necessary of himself without any superiour cause, it followes He is to be adored by all rational creatures essentially inferiour to him, and not by any false, or mock-worship, but in *Spirit and Truth*, for such an adoration only suites his Divine nature. This reason is reinforced by the light of one indubitable Maxim.

*Of the adoration due to God.*

*Quod universis videtur, est verum.* What appeares to all, or at least, to the most Civilized Nations to be a Truth, is so: for such a universal consent of nature is the Dictamen and voice of God the Author of nature; But all Nations ever owned some Religion, therefore this agreement of God and nature is a Truth. The minor is evident (to say nothing of Christians) out of the very writings of Heathens who assure us, though people are found so barbarous as to live without lawes, learning, or civil government, yet no whole nation was ever yet heard of, but owned some kind of *Numen*, some sacrifice, some homage, some worship due to a power either *falsly* or *truly* judged worthy of Reverence and honour. Neither is the force of the Argument infringed by saying, many and very many Nations erred in the Truth of Religion, which may seem as great an Evil as to have none, for thus much is only proved at present, that the voice of nature more easily ownes Religion then it professes one true; That therefore being the universal Testimony or General

*All civilized Nations own a Numen.*

*One difficulty removed.*

General

neral consent of all, cannot be false. *Hæc testimonia anima* (its Tertullians Doctrin which S. Cyprian borrowed from him) *quanto vera, tanto simplicia, quanto simplicia, tanto vulgaria &c.* This general Truth by how much more pure and simple, by so much it's more vulgarly known, by how much more vulgarly known, by so much its more common, by how much more common, by so much it's more natural, by how much more natural, by so much it's more Divine. *Omni literaturâ notius* (saith Tertullian) *omni Doctrinâ agitatus, omni homine Majus*, 'Tis à learning more known and resolved in mans mind than all other learning, greater then man is, and therefore à certain trnth settled in all by the Author of nature, God himself. Now that many err in the truth of Religion, proceeds without doubt too often from want of instruction: sometimes from pride, ignorance, or Malice in the Teacher, which is the deplorable case of condemned Hereticks: Sometimes, and this is most usual, it comes from an obdurance of heart begot, by à custome of sinning and transgressing against the very light of nature. For, this custome bring's à punishment with it, that it darken's the mind notoriously, and makes reason à stranger not only to weighty rational motives which forceably draw us to good, but more over it so stupifies, so dulls and indisposeth à soul, that the impressions of grace (not wanting to the most barbarous) touch, as it were, on flinty rocks, and produce either à weak barren fruit, or rather no penitential fruit at all. Would therfore the most obdurate Scythians, or any other uncivilized People yeild to the ordinary grace allowed them for the avoiding of sin, known contrary to nature: God who illuminates every man in the world, would give more light, until they came to the knowledge of truths necessary, *necessitate medij*, to attain saluation. For this is an undoubted Maxim of Divines. God is not wanting in necessities, and, *Facienti quod in se est non denegat gratiam*. He denies not grace to such as endeavour by the ordinary means afforded them to avoid sin contrary to nature, but if careles of that duty which nature obliges to, they voluntaril y plunge themselves into an Abiss of horrid transgressions, the obdurance now mentioned followes: The powerful operation of grace lies stifled, and much deaded in such hardned hearts,

*The cause of  
Mistaking  
true Reli-  
gion.*



and Consequently sense and love of pleasures bear greatest sway there, which makes reason à stranger to Gods truths, and from hence gross errors concerning Religion take their rise and have their origen. The objection above, purely fallacious, supposeth those different Pretenders to true Religion to be all of equal Authority, and casteth mans weak and erring reason on too long and laborious à work. True Religion is known with lesse Adoe, then these Adversaries Imagin, as we shal shew hereafter, and solve the objection in its due place.

4. I argue 2. from the assumed principle. *God exists Therefore true Religion is*, and discourse thus. There are and ever have been several Religions professed in the world, and all are not false, for if all were false, God, whose existence we now suppose, would see himselfe not at all adored in spirit and truth, but rather Universally scorned by an erroneous worship, as if men had been created for this end to mock and abuse their Creator; And this seem's contrary to the light of reason. Now further. All Religions are not false, *From false Religions, ergo, one onely is true, because two or more which hold Contradictions can not be true; and if one be true, every rational creature is obliged to follow that when 'tis clearly proposed, and to worship his maker by à right way of Homage: but this obligation must suppose the truth of Religion in being, because none can be obliged to embrace à foolery, or to worship God by à meer nothing. You will say, one may be bound to follow an error or an erroneous Conscience, therefore the proof taken from this obligation, evinces not the actual truth of Religion. Answ. When we are bound to follow an error in à matter of chiefe Concern, the Contrary truth, which all should assent to, so really is, that we may be unguided, and set right; but if all Religions are false, there is none true supposable, and Consequently the Universal error of all is à remediless evil. If therefore God requires à true exhibition of worship from his Creatures He cannot permit all to err Universally, and for this reason true Religion is in being. You may reply. God is independent of us all, and need's not our Homage, or adoration. Very true, but man depend's upon God, and by the instinct*

*From false Religions, ergo, one onely true, is proved.*

instinct of nature, is obliged to adore him in truth, which instinct as we shall prove presently, originally proceed's from the Author of nature, and therefore God also obliges all to pay him the true tribute of praise and no Counterfeit worship. Some Perhaps, may object. Religion seem's not Capable of à demonstration, because that which is true *de facto* depend's on God's free Revelation, the Credibility where of can be evidenced, but not the truth. I answer, in the general assertion already made, we abstract from the particular proofs relating to true Religion; we treat with all, who own à Deity, and say, these (if God had not elevated man to supernatural, beatitude, or, omitted to reveal the sublime mysteries, of faith) had, in that State been obliged to adore theyr Creator with no false homage and thus much reason evinces, although we cannot (as the objection proves) strictly demonstrate the truth of Christianity, but only its Credibility, whereof more, and very amply, hereafter. In the mean while

5. Methinks I hear some, who stand much for reason, say, that Atheists (rational men) oppose all Religion, and why may not their Plea be heard in so weighty à matter? Answ. Its not my intention at present to combate too long with Atheists, they are utterley overthrown by the learned Arguments of innumerable grave Authors I have other Adversaries to treat with: However, because their pretence is reason, observe, how they destroy not only Religion but reason also, yea, and extinguish the very light of nature with it.

*Atheism  
proved most  
unreasonable.*

6. The ground of Atheism is this prodigious accursed Principle. *There is no God, no supreme Power, no Numen, no Providence* (for acknowledge à God and Providence, reason evidently concludes, He is to be adored *in spirit and truth*, and this worship or Adoration we call Religion.) This Assertion then, *God is not*, is à prime truth, or the first verity with Atheists, wheron all their human actions depend, by this supposed verity they are regulated during their mortal life. Contrariwise, This Assertion. *God is an eternal Being by himself*, is à prime Loud falshood with them, to be scorned by every one. Hence I argue. That first supposed verity. *God is not*, depraves

*This accursed  
Principle of  
Atheism.*

*Atheism  
destroys the  
light of rea-  
son.*

praves the will, extinguisheth the light of nature, makes men execrable, enormously wicked, impious, sacrilegious, takes of all fear of future punishment and hope of reward, For if there be no God, or no supreme power to punish hainous offences, the most hideous sins imaginable would cease to be pernicious, and consequently every one might without check or torment of Conscience, if it served his ends, kill and destroy all he meets with. No wrong, no open injustice, no Treason, no rebellion, can be invented so monstrous, but may be done without reproof of Conscience, if this Principle hath influence upon what we act. *God who can neither punish, or reward, is not in Being.* And thus you see, how that first Arch-truth of Atheists. *God is not*, horribly depraves and vitiates the will, makes it savage, and brutish, which *ex terminis* is evidently fals, for Truth considered as truth, is a perfection of the understanding, and cannot *per se* pervert nature, or wrest the will in man to all wickednes. On the other side you see, that this Arch-falsity of Atheists. *God is an Eternal Being*, by its own force and light rectifies nature, makes men upright, just, obedient, submissive to lawes and government; which is impossible; for such a grand error setled in mans intellectual faculty, is by it self as wholly unmeet constantly to produce such laudable effects, as Truth is to deceive, or cold water to warm us. You see. 3. that unlesse villany and wickednes be deemed wisdom, and virtue and justice be accounted of as madnesse, Atheists must change the Propositions and say: *God is, remains a supreme Truth. God is not*: is a supreme error, and withall Conclude, that the first intellectual Truth cannot make men wicked, nor the first error make them virtuous.

*Nature has  
her impres-  
sions from  
God. Wit-  
hout God, no  
truth can be  
known.*

7. Some perhaps will reply against our first inference. Nature it self abhors the impieties now mentioned, (and that's the Atheists Rule) although God were not in Being. I answer. Nature doth so now, because it receives those impressions from God, the Author of Grace and nature, but destroy this first Author, *Eo ipso*, you abolish those very first lights of nature, and make it stupidly brutish. The reason hereof a *Priori* is most convincing. Nature is endowed with these first lights, because it receives them from an indefectible,

and unerring intellectual Being, for if this first Power or Being, which gives existence and light to nature, could err, or be deceived in such universal Notions, nature which takes its Being from this first intellectual power, would lose those communicated lights, and fall to nothing. For example. Here is à participated light, or à Truth common to all rational men. *Do as you would be done by*, and nature universally approves it. I ask why is this à supposed Truth? You answer because all agree in it. Be it so. But I say, if all those who agree in it, receive the light from à power that is defective, ignorant, or liable to error, this very consent of nature like that first erring Principle, cannot but be defective, and ignorant, because no effect exceeds the virtue or perfection of the cause it comes from.

8. Will you see this clearly? Suppose that à Casual meeting or concurrence of Atomes made man rational, as Atheists will have it, and induced him with the Truth now mentioned, without the influence of à supreme intellectual Power. This rational thing called man, judges, discourses, defines, and delivers, as he thinks, certainly the first natural verities. Very good. But we inquire further, and Ask from what cause he had this power of judging, and defining truly? For, if he received it from one that's dull, ignorant or deceitful in all he judges, and defines, He cannot but participate of the nature of that first Principle, which is dull and ignorant. Thus much is clear. For if I receive my knowledge from one who is distracted mad, or false in his conceptions, and regulate my self or others by such à communicated light, all I know or teach by virtue of that knowledge, transcends not the nature of that Principle which is now supposed, ignorant, erroneous and deceitful.

*Dull Atomes  
impart not  
knowledge  
to any.*

9. Summon therefore all the Atomes together which made man rational, and imprinted on him the first lights of nature, I demand of those Atomes, could they Answer, How it came to passe, that à company of Dull insensible things, void of reason and discourse could by meer chance, produce man intellectual, and not only intellectual, but unerrable also in some Principles called natural? I say all that this man judges is false, because the Principle which gave him being, (void of light and understanding) cannot induce him with

unerra-

*The reason  
why none  
can judge  
truly, if  
God exist  
not.*

*The Sceptiks  
erred not  
upon one  
false supposi-  
tion.*

*An other  
demonstra-  
tion against  
Atheists.*

unerrable Truths. For, *Nemo dat quod non habet*; No cause gives to its effects, what it precontains not. Insensible Atomes therefore, cannot make man sensible, nor irrational Atomes, reasonable, nor stupid Atomes, devoid of truth imbue him with the first true Principles. Therefore man is no more to be believed in these first lights of nature, than if Apes or Parots should speak them, because, as we now suppose, they proceed not originally from any intellectual Power, but only from meer dust or insensible things, void of understanding. The Sceptiks therefore erred not, when upon the supposition that God made not man, they concluded: we know nothing, we judge of nothing truly, but what might be excepted against, and rationally opposed. If therefore nature err's not in these first Principles, now acknowledged true and rational, ascribe it to nature, but leave not of there, but say these lights come from God the Author of nature, who neither will, nor can deceive us. Here then is our grand Principle. *God and nature cannot err*, therefore the verity and certainty of these first known truths depending on God and nature, are free from error. And

10. Hence we have an other clear demonstration against Atheists. Either God indowed man with reason and these first lights of nature, or all of us, even Atheists may be justly deemed mad, and befotted with fooleries, but all (including Atheists) are not mad, nor erring in these first lights of nature, *Ergo* God indued man with those first lights. I prove the Major. It is perfect madness in the judicative power of man to deny the truth of those first lights, but the truth of them must be denied, in case we receive our judicative faculty from a Power inferior to God, for, if we receive it not from an infinite Being, we have it from some inferior erring cause, which may deceive. (Atomes for example) but neither atomes nor any inferior fallible Power, can transfuse into us a certainty of not erring in those first lights. The reason is given. The lights we have, goe not beyond the perfection of that cause which imparts them to nature; This cause, what ever it be is inferior to God, and therefore cannot but be liable to error, and may deceive us. Observe this discourse well, for it is the ground *a Priori*, of the Churches infallibility, wherof more hereafter.

11. You

## Convinced unreasonable.

9

11 You have other arguments most concluding against Atheists, but I cannot insist on all. Here is one and a speculation of a great Diuine. A Being existing by it self infinitely perfect, or without mixture of imperfection, is *ex conceptu suo formali*, or, Apprehended vnder that Notion no chimæra, nor impossible Object (as impossible objects are distinguished from possibilities) therefore it is possible. I proue it. All Chimæras or Impossibilities essentially imply imperfection, because they cannot be, and consequently vpon that account want perfection, but this infinite Being conceiued by man wants no perfection (I say conceiued, for I neither yet proue nor suppose any thing, but only speak of an object thus represented to an vnderstanding, and say that object is no impossibility because infinitely perfect, without appearance of flaw or imperfection.) Now further; if such an object *ex terminis* be possible, and not impossible, it is of necessity actually existing, for if it haue not an actual Being, it wants perfection, and requires à more perfect cause to produce it, which is contrary to the nature of that which I conceiue, and form in my vnderstanding; But if it be actually in Being, I haue all I seek for. *Ens actu existens*, an actual existency without any superior cause, infinitely wise, without blemish or imperfection, and this we call God, the Origen of all things, Creator of Heauen and earth. But I waue these speculations, moral arguments without them haue weight enough, and could we say no more but thus much only; That Atheists in à matter of Eternal saluation (the weightiest point imaginable) deliberately embrace that Doctrin which can neuer do them good, *If true*; and eternally damn them, *if fals*; it were enough. Obserue well. Were Atheism true, the Professors of it dye like doggs, and so do all others with them, these men therefore will not hereafter laugh at Belieuers for adoring. à Deity; but if their Doctrin proues fals in the other life, all true Christians may scorn their impudency, or rather deplore their eternal misery which will follow, not only vpon the account of Atheism, but for other enormous sins committed against God and nature. Now if the Atheist saies he

*Asperation  
Argument.*

*Moral Ar-  
guments in  
this matter  
sway most.*

B

fol-



*Good Christians in this life haue more content then Atheists.*

followed the Dictate of his reason, this ( were it so ) at most excuses him from the sin of Atheism, but frees him not from damnation, if guilty of other criems against the light of Nature. If he say again, he fully enioyes his pleasures in this life, whilst those who belieue à God, liue in restraint and fear. He pleads Non-sense, for à good Christian, if we exclude some horrid sins which nature ex creat's, may haue his dignities in à common wealth, his lawful pleasures, and recreations as much as any Atheist; herein he hath no preheminance before others, no nor so much content as is allowed good Christians; Therefore on all accounts he is in à worse condition then Christians, for he liues condemned here the whole world ouer, and can expect no happines hereafter.

*Atheists conuicted of errors though à Deiry were not demonstrable.*

12. Others argue and methinks very solidly. Though Gods existence were not demonstrable, Atheists may neuer the less be not only conuicted of error, but iustly also look't on as in à damnable state, vpon the account of their Atheism. Here is my reason. The very rules of nature and ciuility oblige vs to respect all according to the *outward appearances* of their quality and condition, when we haue no iust reasons which render them suspected. It would be open iniustice to treat any one, either in language or actions like an inferiour fellow, whose traine or garbe speak's him à Prince, or nobleman. I should certainly err in iustice and morallity, should I deny any one that respect which the Common reputation of his virtues and accomplishments, hath gained him (though perhaps not deserued) when I haue no Conuincing proofs, that he is not what he seem's. There is no Atheist of them all, but would think him self highly iniured were he slighted in this nature, and with good reason too, for the meer possibility of being deceiu'd in à mans quality or virtues, can be no sufficient warrant for any to deny him that honour, which his virtues in all *appearance* challenge as his due.

13. I say therefore, were the Deiry supposed indemonstrable, that cannot excuse the Atheist from performing those duties

## Convinced unreasonable.

11

duties which such à Being, in all appearance, most infinite wise, and omnipotent may challenge, of praise and Adoration, proportionable to his worth: For, if the Atheist exact's all punctilios of respect from others, which the exterior garbe of his dignity may intitle him to, he cannot without the highest wrong, and violating the law of nature (*Doe as you would be done by*) deny to God, after so many signal appearances of his dignity, the due respect and honour, wherunto that supreme excellence most iustly saies claime.

14. Now if you make inquiry after the appearances of that supereminent excellence in à Deity, they farr surpass all those other appearances which can possibly concur to create in any an opinion of mans greatnes, virtues, or accomplishments. No Monarch, no Prince, no Potentate, no nobleman can giue so many euident signes of worth and excellence (duely laid claime to) as God evidences of an infinite greater supereminent worth, due and proper to himself. Euery one knowes, that wisdom, power, and worthy actions, enoble man; and beget in all à vniuersal fame of excellence. What think ye? Doth not the creation, the continual preservation, and admirable Oëconomie of this visible world loudly speak the wisdom, power, and noble works of à Deity? Do not these raise in all à vniuersal fame of his Being? Haue not all ciuillized nations (agreeing in the truth) the very best of philosophers in past ages, and all Christians (the most wise and learned body of men which the world euer yet saw) purchased to God, vpon euident appearances, more immortal honour and renown, than euer Prince or Monarch gained suitable to his state and dignity? If therfore to deny à Prince to be what he seem's, when all imaginable appearances speak him Prince, be most iustly deemed à crying iniury contrary to the light of nature; much more to deny God his Being is à greater wrong, when all the testimonies of grace and nature proclaim him God. One word more and I end this point. So many eminent and signal miracles both before and after our Sauours comming, which could proceed from no other cause but God; el-

Wherin the  
excellence of  
God appe-  
ars,

ther evidently demonstrate his Being (as we shall see presently) or make the truth so apparantly credible, that, is à degree of madness to deny it. The Atheist therefore, who without proof or principle denies God, and deprives him of that respect which ought to be paid vpon outward signs and evident appearances of his excellence, impiously opposes right reason, and sin's damnably; Nor can the supposed *indemonstrability* of God, more excuse him from damnable irreligion, then the *possibility* of being deceiued in any mans worth or accomplish'd virtues (whem apparent signes make them evident) from wrong and open iniustice, as is now said.

15. Lastly the Atheist who pretend's to believe nothing, believes (it's true differently) as much, yea and as hard things, as any Christian doth. The Christian believes à God he neuer saw, and the Atheist an infinite series of causes, or à strange concours of inuisible Atomes he neuer saw. The Christian believes the soul he neuer saw to be immortal, the Atheist, who yet neuer saw so much, holds it vanishes into nothing. The Christian saith an infinite wisdom rules the world, The Atheist sayes no, but either fate or chance, (as much imperceptible to sense as God is) Gouverns all. You see therefore, how these men who pretend to believe nothing, believe as much as any, *for we all believe*, but with this difference, that the Atheist imprudently iudging incredibilities believable fastens on them, and leaues to Christians à belief of verities not only *prudently credible*, but most true and certain. Mark their blindness and à iust iudgment of God with it. They reiect things credible, and in lieu of these pitch on most desperate improbabilities, and this ineuitably: for, not to believe *credible verities* forceth them to believe the contrary, *incredible fooleries*. The Atheists arguments run all vpon fals suppositions where of see more In the second discourse. God they say, seems carelesse in governing the world, whilst He suffers the innocent to be oppressed, and vniust men to enioy much happinesse. Mark first, They suppose some innocent, and others vniust, wheras if we deny God, there can neither be innocence nor vniustice, as is

now

*The Atheists  
believe  
differently,  
but more  
difficult  
things then  
Christians.*

now demonstrated. 2. They measure Gods infinite wisdom in gouerning his creatures by their short fallible Conceptions and suppose him vnable to punish the wicked, and to reward the iust in a future life. But enough of this subiect, most amply handled by others.

## CHAP. II.

*Reason reiects all sects or Religions not Christian.  
Whether Gentilism, Iudaism; or Turcism,  
bee erroneous and improbable?*

1. **W**EE here exclude professed Atheists vowed enemies of all Religion, And now treat with other Aduersaries but very briefly, they are either Heathens, Turks, or Iewes, list if you please with These all condemned Hereticks, as Arians, Pelagians, Donatists and the like rabble of Aliens from truth, who really deserue not the name of Christians.

2. The Gentils or Heathens that adored many Gods as *Mars, Iupiter, Apollo*, and therefore plain Idolaters, (because they make deceased men Gods) are now of no account in the world. Turks, Iewes, Christians and all other decry their vanity, or to speak in S. Chrysostoms words: *ipsius Christi virtute dissipati sunt*, They are wasted, dissolued, and brought to nothing by the virtue of Christ our Sauours preaching, *Diuturnitate temporum perierunt*, Time has worn them out, we need say no more.

3. Turcism which hath gained a great part of the world, and a far greater, then euer any particular Herefy gained, is evidently no more but an open Tyranny. The sword, no word of God, doth all. Power, and carnal pleasures, which corrupted nature easily embraceth, vphold this Religion. More cruelty followes the Professors of it, then lustice, fidelity, or any moral virtue; yet moral virtue, grounded in nature, euer accompanys

*A demon-  
stration  
against  
Turkism*

true Religion. Again, and here is à Demonstration against Turkeilm. Mahomet (who held himself à Prophet only, and no God) appeared some centuries after Christ, yea and owned both Christ, and Moyſes to haue been great Prophets, sent from God. Hence I argue. If sent from God; the Doctrin they deliuered was true. Therefore Mahomets Alcoran is false, which contradict's not only Christs Doctrin, but that also of Moses and the Prophets. The contradiction is euident by the Alcoran: and the inference, *Ergo*, The Alcoran contradict's God himself, speaking truth by these Prophets, is as clear. Therefore either God contradict's himself, saying one thing by these Prophets, and reuoking it by Mahomet, (which is impossible) or Mahomet is à lyar. Yet more. Let Mahomet iudge as he pleaseth of Christ and the Prophets, He and his, are obliged to satisfy one Demand: viz. What Doctrin that was, wherby men were saued, before his preaching? And I speak of Doctrin, not of Ceremonies or temporal positiue Lawes. He will not say, all from Adam to his dayes were damned for want of true Doctrin, nor can he haue recours to the Multiplicity of Gods owned by Heathens, these He reiects: Therefore he must acknowledge true Doctrin taught before his being in the world, but this Doctrin, Moses, Christ, and the Prophets truly deliuered, or there was none taught in the world, This saued souls anciently, therefore, if believed, it saues them still; once it was true; therefore it is now and will be euer so, But Mahomet opposeth him self to this true reuealed Doctrin, therefore He opposeth God speaking by these Oracles. Hence I argue. A Religion which began fifty ages after truth was taught in the world, and expresly contradict's that taught truth, is false; Mahomets Religion is euidently such, ergo it is false. I say that contradict's the ancient true Doctrin, to preuent an obiection which may arise out of ignorance. For some may say: Christ our Lord long after Moses and the Prophets, deliuered Doctrin contrary to them, therefore the Argument against Mahomet conuinceth not. I answer, It is one thing to reueal Truth à new not anciently believed, and an other to abrogate ancient receiued verities. Christ, besides

*Mahomets  
error Very  
late, opposit  
to ancient  
truth,*

cancelling

cancelling the Ceremonial law deliuered more truths, then were explicitly declared by the Prophets, but neuer contradicted any Doctrin proceeding from God, by the mouth of his Prophets, as Mahomet did. Hence S. Austin and other Fathers Affirm, that Christs Church reuerences the Doctrin of Moses and the Prophets, and that faith hath euer been the same from the beginning of the world.

4. The Iewes who make their Religion most ancient, are notwithstanding clearly conuincd of error, and here is my first Argument. A People disperfed vp and down the world, that haue had now for 16. ages neither *Essence* nor *Form of true Religion*, nor the effects or fruits of it, cannot profess true Religion, and consequently are not the lawful heires of the Prophets ancient Faith. But the Iewes are thus evidently disperfed, and want the *Essence*, the *Form*, and effects of Religion, Ergo. I proue the Minor. A sacrifice essential to Religion which could not, according to their law, be offered but in Hierusalem only: A Temple and Priests also evidently fail them (for no Sacrifice no Priest) Iudges, Prophets and miracles, cognisances also of true Religion, which neuer failed in their greatest Captiuities, now by the iust iudgement of God leaue them, therefore the very Form and order of Religion wholly reuerfed, manifest this people, once, *Populum iam non populum*, heretofore blessed, now accursed for their obstinacy. And if we speak of other effects, or fruits of Religion, their Thalmudick Fables, their vnſatiable auarice, their cheating and Cozening others, their open Hypocrisy (for gain They exteriourly profess any Religion) now Catholicks, now Protestants, now Arians, or what you will. These effects I say, demonstrate à want of the very Soul, of the life of virtue, and Religion in them: All which is manifest to our eyes and senses.

*The Iewes  
à disperfed  
People with-  
out essence or  
form of  
Religion.*

5. To add force to this most weighty Argument. S. Cyprian chiefly in his first book *Aduers. Iudaos*, shewes all along how *Their* they were foretold by the very law and ancient Prophets of their *dereliction* losing Religion, and future dereliction, after Christs comming *foretold in scripture.*  
viz.



viz. That Their first lawes and carnal circumcision were to cease, and à new law with spiritual circumcision to succeed. Isay. 8. Mich. 4. That an other order and à new Testament should be giuen, Ier. 31. That the old Pastors were to leaue of their teaching, and new Doctors come in their place Ier. 3. and. 31. That no other but Christ himself was to be the *true Temple and house of God*, 2. Reg. 7. That the old sacrifices of lambes and beasts should not be offered. Isay 1. That the old Priesthood was to fail, and à new Priest and king raig for euer. Ps 109. 1. Reg: 2. That the greater People, the Iewes, should become the lesse, and the Gentils far lesser become greater Gen. 15. Osee, 2. That à Church once barren should haue more Children than the Synagogue euer had. Isā. 5. 4. vpon those words. *lucundare steriliū*. Thus S. Cyprian through those feuerall short chapters of his first book. And we see all these propheties literally fulfilled after the comming of our Sauour, and the establishment of the Christian Church. Those hearts are stupid, and eyes blind, that perceiue not the Iewish synogogue vtterly abandoned. Yet more. If you will see this Christian verity amply laid forth, read the 9. chapter of Daniel, where the Holy Prophet after à large declaration of the Peoples iniquities and à iust affliction laid on them for their Sins, an Angel told him that Christ should come, and be slain, and v. 26. that those were not to be his People, who would deny him. verse 27. He fortold the ceasing of their sacrifice, and v. 24. denotes 4. things: Forgiueneſſe of sins, infusion of Iustice, fulfilling of Propheties, and the anointing of the Holy of Holies: All which particulars litterally and most exactly agree to our Sauour, and to him only. Thus the Prophet Daniel. But that which I would haue euery one to ponder is the prediction of Christ our Lord Matth. 21. in the parable of the vineyard, where speaking to the chief Priests and Pharisies, he clearly prophesied of their ruin and reiection before it happened. *A certain householder, saith the Gospel, planted à vineyard &c. and let it out to husbandmen, When the time of fruits drew nigh, he sent his seruants to receiue the fruits. Those husbandmen seized vpon the Seruants, Beat one, killed an other and*

*the prophet  
Daniels  
prediction.*

*The parable  
of the  
vineyard.*

## Religions, not Christian. 17

and stoned à third. Here our Sauour clearly alludes to the slain and stoned Prophets. Again this Housholder sent forth other seruants more then the former, who were treated in like manner. Lastly he sent his own Son to them, saying, they will reuerence my Son, but, saith the Text, They apprehended him also, cast him out of the vineyard and killed him, and thus the Iewes abused and massacred Christ our Lord. Next our Sauour proposeth this question to the elders amongst them. *When therefore the Lord of the Vineyard shall come, what will he do to these husbandmen?* They answer. *Males male perdet.* He will bring these naughty men to naught, and let his vineyard out to other husbandmen, that shall render him fruit in due season. Now followes the very life and soul of the whole parable. *Iesus said to them, haue you not read in Scripture, the stone which the builders reiected, the same is made into the head of the corner? This is done by our Lord, and it is merueilous in our eyes; Ideo dico vobis, Therefore I say to you: The Kingdom of God shall be taken away from you, and shall be giuen to a nation, yielding the fruits thereof. &c.* The Chief Priests and Pharisies, saith the Gospel, knew he meant them. The kingdome therefore wherof our B: Lord spake, and fortold should be giuen to another, appear's manifestly Gods own glorious work, laid open to our eyes and senses in the Christian Catholick Church.

*The force of this parable.*

6. Hence Tertullian lib. aduersus Iudæos C. 8. drawes an other forcible argument against the Synagogue, from the large extent of Christs glorious Kingdom, now established. Obserue well. It was prophesied, saith this learned Doctor, Daniel. 7. that Christ should reign euery where, not like à Salomon in the Confines of Iudæa, nor like à Nabuchodonosor from India to Æthiopa, nor like an Alexander of macedonia, who was neuer Master of so ample à Dominion as Christ Iesus possesseth. No. *Christi regnum* (they are his words) *vbiq; porrigitur, vbiq; creditur, vbiq; regnat, vbiq; adoratur.* The Kingdom of Christ is extended euery where, is believed euery where, reigns euery where, and is adored in all places. And thus, the Roman Catholick Religion, though neuer so strongly oppressed, is euery where, whilst

*Tertullianus Discourse.*

C

Mahometism

Mahometisme and Heresy are restrained to such and such Dominions) If Therefore the Jewes own à Messias, Christ our Lord who hath founded such à kingdom, is the only true Messias. I proue it. Were he not, but that an other is yet to be expected, God could not haue permitted those manifest Miracles, signes and wonders wrought by him to haue introduced an error in place of the ancient true Religion, which the Jewes professed. Iudaism therefore would haue stood still vnshaken in its ancient vigour, had not Christ Iesus powerful works, brought it to an utter ruin. But these, (and its Christs own Argument,) Iohn 15. *If I had not done* *No prophet so work amongst them &c.*) far surpassed in worth Maiesty, and greatnes all the wonders of Moses and the Prophets: For none of them euer raised themselves from death to life again. None of them reuiued one like Lazarus 4. daies buried. None had the sea and Elements at command like Christ. None shewed such wonders at their death, as our dying Lord did. None fed so many thousands in the desert with five loaves and two fishes. None cured any with the hemm of their garments. None wrought such strange Conversions, as Christ &c. I pass ouer other signal wonders related in the Gospel, as the Prophets miracles are recounted in the old testament, and briefly Argue. Where greater signes and miracles, which cannot but proceed from God, euidence Religion, there is true Religion. But most vdeniably, Christ shewed greater signes and miracles at the founding of his Kindom, then either Moses or the Prophets manifested, therefore he taught true Religion, and by virtue of those wonders reuerfed Iudaism, and made it improbable. I say *greater* and mark wel my Reason. Had not Christs illustrious works most eminently surpassed those of Moses and the Prophets, but been as it were equal with them, Christ's glorious Kingdom could neuer haue come to so mighty à growth, to so vast an extent as now it is, it could not haue wrought such strange conuersions as we see it done, the whole world ouer. why? A lesser or equal Euidence for Truth can no more obscure or lessen an other greater or equal Euidence, then one candle darken an other, (as we see the light of the sun doth.) Therefore that euidence which made the Synagogue credible

*No prophet so work amongst them &c.*  
*potent in*  
*miracles as*  
*Christ.*

*The reason*  
*of our*  
*sanctious*  
*Large*  
*extended*  
*Kingdom.*

credible to the Jewes, was to be taken away with a far greater light of manifest signes and wonders, shewed to Christians. For If we suppose the Evidence equal in both cases (seeing no Religion is manifestly true of it self without antecedent motives) we might all yet as securely profess Judaism, as Christianity, and Therefore our Blessed Lord spake a most profound Point of Doctrin, when he said. *Had he not wrought greater wonders amongst them, then ever any did, they would have been excusable and without sin*, which Doctrin implies this great verity, that true Religion where ever it is, pleads most powerfully for it self, yea dead's and vanquishes error by a most clear Evidence of glorious works, and Miracles. And mark well this Discourse, it is destructive of all Heresy, as shall be proved here after.

7. Who ever desires more of this subject may vouchsafe to read that excellent Epistle of Rabbi Samuel Marrochianus then a Converted Christian, to Rabbi Isaac an Israelite. You have it Tomo. 2. Biblioth. Patrum Collain print seculo 11. pag. 421. He writ the Epistle after the yeare 1000. 6. Centuries since, or there about: and it contains, 27. short chapters. The work is admirable, and most expresse for Christianity. In the first Chapter he laies forth the horrid Transgressions of the Jewes, their Idolatry and killing of the Prophets, and saith Gods wrath was appeased for these sins, as Scripture assures vs, when our people (saith he) were set at liberty. *But now we have been dispersed and scattered a thousand yeares and more, and Gods indignation yet followes vs every where, nes in Prophetia promissum fuit, and there is no end promised in the Prophets, be cause of our wickednes:* And if you ask what enormous guilt that was? He answers in his 6. Chapter, pondering these words of the Prophet Amos c. 2. *upon three crimes of Iuda I will Convert, or as the Rabbi reads, transveram, put away, but upon the fourth I will not convert, because they have sold the iust for silver.* *Peneq Domine.* I tremble, saith Marrochianus, when I read this sentence, for this iust man was not Ioseph sold into Egypt, nor the fourth hainous wickednes (which he proves manifestly) but was the iust Lord Iesum, whom

The  
Excellent  
discourse of  
Marrochia.  
now  
converted to  
Christia-  
nity.

the Iewes sold for silver, and here is the greatest and most crying sin for which we are punished. In the 19. Chap. ( I cannot insist on all ) He saith, that Prophecy of Zach : C. 13. *strike the shepherd and his sheep shall be disperſed*, was fulfilled, when the Israelites smit that great Pastor of the Apostles, *Iesw*, then it was that they, anciently his flock, were scattered vp and down the face of the earth, and that the Apostles succeeded in the place of our Prophets : *For ſince that Time we Iewes haue had no Pastors, no Prophets, no visions, no sacrifice, no obseruance of Moſes law, no Holocaust, no form of Religion &c.* Thus he discourſes through ſeueral Chapters, and in the last, the 27. after he had declared what great respect the very Turcks and Saracens shew to Iesus Christ, and his blessed Mother Mary: Of Christ, their Alcoran saith, that He is the true Meſſias, yea and preſerr His Genealogy before Mahomets, for Mahomets parents were Idolaters and had their Origen from Agar the handmaid, Christ descended by à lineal ſucceſſion from Iſaac and the Prophets by à right line, to the blessed virgins birth. The Alcoran more ouer saith, that *Eliſi* ( in the Arabick tongue 'tis *Iesw* ) knew all things, the whole book's of Moſes, the ſecrets of mens hearts, had power giuen him to work Miracles, to cure all diſeaſes, to caſt out Diuels, and therefore own him as à mighty great Prophet, and the true Meſſias. Much honor and respect alſo is giuen by the Turks to our blessed Lady, as you may read in that Chapter. After, I ſay, à larger Diſcourſ of theſe two ſubiects, our Christian *Samuel* concludes, that the Iewes haue been à deſerted People for à thouſand yeares, we may add 600 to them. The Turks yet daily increaſe by the force of armes, and Christians alſo ſtrangly propagate by the power and virtue of Christ, both oppoſe vs. *Nos autem nihil proſpicimus, teſtimonium multorum ſtat contra nos*, we Iſraelits yet aduance nothing, in ſo much that the malediction of Ruben light's vpon vs. *Non creſcas*, we are ſtill, and ſhall be ignominious, we proſper not. Such is the iudgement of God againſt vs. This and much more, *Marrochianus* deliuered Six ages ſince againſt his Nation.

*Iewes  
abandoned.*

CHAP. III.

CHAP. III.

*Christianity as it stands in opposition to Iewes,  
Turks, Infidels and Heretickes, is the  
only true Religion.*

1. **T**He Assertion is an evident Inference out of the former discours, for if true Religion be in the world, and not found amongst Heathens, Turks, or Iewes, Those only called Christians enjoy that blessing, or there is no Religion at all in being. Though the Proposition stand's firm on this sole proof, yet I'll strengthen it with two Conuincing Arguments. The first. Where we evidently find the marks, cognisances, and signes of true Religion, there it is, but Christs Doctrin only which we call Christianity is vndeniably manifested by clear signes and cognisances of truth, and therfore is the true Religion. I proue the Minor. A cause is best known by its effects, the tree by its fruits, the sun by its light, Faith by its works, and the Existence of God by the emanation of his creatures. But no other Religion whether it be that of Iewes, Turks or Heathens euer shewed to the world the like effects of Truth, the like glorious Miracles, the like austerity of life, the like contempt of transitory Goods, the like efficacy of Doctrin, or, brought so many Infidels from incredulity, so many from sensuallity to a holy virtuous life, as Christ and his Apostles gained soon after the first promulgation of the Gospel: Therefore these most illustrious marks and cognisances of Christianity, as clearly conuince that God deliuered truth by the Preaching of our blessed Lord, and his Elect Apostles, as any effect in nature demonstrat's the cause it comes from. The Marks are manifest to our eyes and senses, and plead most powerfully for our Christian Doctrin. No other sect falsely called Religion, has evidenced the like signes, and this, I am sure no Christian can deny.

*The first  
Argument.*

C 3

2. A



## 22 Disc. 1. C. 3. Christianity, as opposite to Iewes &c.

*An Other  
taken from  
the miracu-  
lous propa-  
gation of  
Christian  
Religion.*

*Four things  
Considerable  
in the propa-  
gation of the  
Gospel.*

2. A second argument is so weighty, in the behalfe of Christs sacred Doctrin, that though we had no knowledge of God or Prouidence vpon other Principles, that which I am now to propose, would make both most vndoubted. I argue therefore. That Religion whose Author, Founder, and chief Preferuer is God (we here suppose with Iewes and Turks the actual existence of a Deity) is manifestly the true Religion, for God cannot found or teach falshood, but Christian Religion, as taught by Christ and his Apostles, had and has God for its Author, Founder, and Preferuer, therefore it is the only true Religion. I proue the Minor. A Religion drawn into a law of liuing holily, which Miraculously began, and was spred the whole world ouer, aboute the power and force of nature, is manifestly from God, and subsist's by Diuine virtue only, (Diuels neuer help't in so pious a work) but our Holy Christian Religion, was and is still thus miraculously spred and preferred also, all Nations ouer, aboute the power and force of nature, therefore it is from God, and subsists by his Diuine virtue. To proue that it began miraculously, and was propagated aboute the power and force of nature, we are to ponder these four things. 1. The sublime Doctrin of Christian Religion. 2. The condition of those first Masters who taught it, and in what difficult circumstances. 3. The Quality and number of souls gained to belieue it. 4. By what means they were induced to Assent. Obserue well: You will find in euery particular a Prodigious work aboute the force of nature, and no other but Gods powerful hand concurring with it. Thus it is.

3. When the world lay as it were in a dead sleep of sin and ignorance thoughtlesse God knowes, of casting so much as a thought towards Heauen, or of louing any good, but what sense and corrupted nature liked of. A new Doctrin sad to sense, and mighty difficult to reason was heard of. *Blessed are the poor in spirit. Humility scarce heard of before, was then cryed vp for a great virtue: Wrongs were to be forgiven, lawes obeyed, iustice obserued &c.* But was sensuallity only thus Crossed in its propensions? No. A load of high Misteries besides, was laid on Reason also, which seemed to rack

rack and torture it. God one in essence and three distinct persons. *God an Infant born of a virgin.* A Lord Iesus, true God and man, after a wearisome life Scourged by impious hands and finally Crucified. such (with much more) was the strange Doctrin of Christianity. How euer (and here is the Miracle or prodigious work) it got ground, spread it self far and neer, and though contrary to sensuallity, and aboue Reason, yet millions of souls so firmly believed it, though austere and hard, that innumerable haue dyed for it. Now if this be not a wonder, or a prodigious work aboue the force of nature, we may well conclude with. S. Austin lib. 22. de Ciuit. c. 5. This to be the *greatest Miracle of all*, that God conuerted the world without Miracles.

4. The. 2. consideration yet encreaseth the wonder of this admirable work. We know great effects require proportionable causes of like strength, and virtue. A weak child lift's not vp a weighty burden, nor can a mean handfull of naked men defeat a puissant Army. Ponder well the Propagation of Christs Gospel, and the Conuerfions of Nations to Christian Faith, visible to our eyes, the work is without dispute, great, noble, and glorious. But say by what cause, by what instruments, or Ministers did God effect it? Did he send Angels from Heauen to preach a *Trinity*, a *Crucified Saviour*, &c. or force Christians to a belief of those *mysteries by strength of arms*; No. *Rex noster Pacificus*, Our Diuine Iesus is the God of peace. *Non in Commotione Dominus.* No tumultuous spirit brought in his Doctrin. Caluins tragical proceedings in the late begotten Heresy was not heard of, when Christ our Lord and his Disciples preached the Gospel. Some perhaps will say that Gods great intention when he first laid the foundation of Religion, was to destroy Idolary and to establish a new law against Iudaism, and therefore proceeded as the world visually doth, in weighty matters. He surely made choise of most *expert Advocates*, of the wisest *Philosophers*, of the profoundest Iudges, and most eloquent Orators on earth, and by these pleaded for Christianity. 'Tis an error, all was contrary: Our euer glorious God did his own work by twelue poor Fishermen, ignoble, ignorant,

*By what  
instruments  
the Gospel  
was dilated.*

## 24 Disc. 1. C. 3. Christianity, as opposite to Iewes &c.

ignorant, friendlesse and destitute of all that the world makes account of, yea, and he shewed this power more by these weak Instruments; and their successors in after ages, than he did before whilst he liued with them, to manifest that the work was his *Principally*, and theirs *instrumentally*. This Doctrin is so fully deliuered by the great Apostle of the Gentils, that we need not S. Chrysostoms Eloquent Discours on the subiect in his sermon. *Christ is God*. To illustrate it further (though that also merits à serious reflection) I will destroy, saith S. Paul 1. Cor. 1. 19. *The Wisdom of the Wise, and reiect the prudence of the prudent &c. Hath not God made the Wisdom of the World foolish? for because in the Wisdom of God, the World did not by Wisdom know God, it pleased God by the foolishnes of Preaching to saue them that beleeue &c. For that which is foolish to God, is wiser then men, and that which is the infirm of God, is stronger then men. See your vocation, Bretheren, that not many Wise according to the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, but the foolish things of the World, God hath chosen, that he may confound the Wise, and the weak things of the World, that he may confound the strong; and the base things of the World, and the contemptible, God hath chosen, and those things which are not, that he might destroy those things which are, that no flesh may glory in his sight.* Which is to say humane power had no hand in this glorious work, and therefore it is as manifestly aboue the force of nature, as if Christ Iesus had sent 12. little Children to conuert the world, for 'tis no lesse à miracle to see so great à work done by 12. poor fishermen, then by 12. young Children.

5. 3. Consider the number and quality of souls gained to our Christian belief, and ask whether they were à few only, or of so flexible à temper as to credit any thing vpon hearsay. You will answer they were not few. Witnesse the conuersion of whole nations, and if we Consider nature, no lesse. obstinate than numerous. *Incredulum illud genus humanum*, saith Arnobius lib. 1. *Contra Gentes*. Mankind most stubborn and incredulous, contrary to its former liberty and education, submitted to the yoke of Christ, which truth, as this Author obserues, were it not as euident as day light, would haue been thought impossible. Perhaps you'l say (though many), they

The number  
gained in  
numerable.

they were yet simple and ignorant and therefore easily wrought on. No. A Learned Dyonisius, a Clemens Romanus, and innumerable other great capacities, called on, came in to the Church, such choice ones, (God cooperating with his weak instruments,) were drawn out of error and darknesse, to the light of the Gospel. Now if you ask in the last place, by what means these conversions were made? The Gospel answers Mark 16: 17. *By signs and manifest wonders from Heaven. Going into the World preach the Gospel to all creatures &c. and them who believe, these signs shall follow. In my name they shall cast out Devils, speak with tongues.* as the Apostles did, in the feast of Pentecost. *They went forth, saith the Text, preached every where, our Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs which followed.* Signs therefore and Miracles works of Divine virtue without violent hands or humane industry cast down Idols, outed Iudaism, and induced Aliens from Christ to believe his sacred Gospel. These Arguments, as I now said, so forceably evidence a power above nature in the establishing of Christianity, that if we had no other Proofs for the Existence of God, these alone without dispute Convince most sufficiently, the being of a Numen above us, who has demonstrated his providence in laying the foundation of Christian Religion, so firmly.

#### CHAP. IV.

*Whether Christian Religion since its first Propagation hath not been in like manner preserved pure, and further spread by Divine Providence, above the power of Nature?*

- I. **I** Answer Affirmatively and say, that the Augmentation or further growth of Christian Religion, is to be esteemed no lesse a work of providence and Divine Assistance, then its first

Christians  
by further  
Spread  
about the  
force of Na-  
ture.

establishment was. One reason is. The Doctrine preached to innumerable People was Christian in the Apostles' mind, was the same sublime learning (of a Trinity, of the Incarnation, and other difficult Mysteries) The stubbornness and incredulity of those who heard it (at last induced to believe) were alike in them, as in the first converted Christians, Propensious to sensuality which they quitted; as strong, and violent; The number of those after gained souls; you may hold far more, their wisdom not inferior to the former, and the quality of innumerable (witness so many Emperours, Kings and Princes) drawn in following ages to Christianity, much exceeded those first converted by the Apostles. Clear and manifest miracles (effects of Gods power only) have been more numerous, in the Centuries since the Apostles preaching, then before. What eues therefore proues the first Propagation of the Gospel miraculous, or à work above the strength of nature, as forceably convinceth the Truth we here plead for. Now if some object! These later Preachers of the Church sent abroad to preach Christs Doctrine, had much more of the humane learning, then those first great masters of Christianity, and therefore might well by natural Eloquence and humane literature gain many without Diuine Assistance. I answer, when the Poets perswade me that Orpheus harp and harmony tamed wild beasts and moued stones, 'He belieue( and not Sooner) that wolues became lambs, that the stony hearts of Infidels were softned, and made subiect to Christs sacred law, by the power of humane learning only. What! that natural knowledge, got by industry, could vanquish Idolatry, obscure Iudaism and draw innumerable Heathens to deny sensuality, to liue à mortified life, and believe in à crucified Saviour? is not only à Paradox about expressions, but à vast improbability?

2. You know there are two things the world stands for, *Pro aris & focis*, that is for Religion and earthly commodities. Religion, you see, hath the Preheminence. Imagin now, that à Heathen Prince should send the most Eloquent and learned Doctors within his Dominions vpon this hard enterprize, To gain à forreign Monark and People highly averse from him, his lawes, and commands, Withall,

Withall, to abandon their old Religion and admit of a new one ; without the least hope of any worldly interest. Nay contrary, most assured to lose much, which nature seek's after ; Would such a Policy (think yee) take? or could these Doctors though never so Eloquent have confidence to bring about their designe ; by wit or learning only? No. You will judge it impossible to gain so much as one sole Province, when no motive of earthly commodity enters, but much against it. Here is our very case. The Church of Christ in ages following the Apostles, sent abroad her Missioners, and These commissioned Preachers, have not only destroyed Altars erected to false Gods ; most obstinately defended by Gentils, but introduced a new sacred Religion in place of them, mightily opposite to sensuality and what ever the world boues (here is the tribute payd to Christ) can we therefore think that we did this work? or perswade our selves, that a little breath drawn only from natural knowledge, threw down these Altars? No. a Divine virtue, and that most Powerful did the deed, God only wrought these Conversions, no lesse admirable, then Evident to our eyes. When S. Peter, as we read in the Gospel Luk. 5. 4. launched forth into the deep at Christs command, and drew up great Multitudes of fishes, both he and others stood amazed at the Miracle : And more iustly may all admire the far greater multitude of men, drawn out of a gulf of sin and ignorance then forold, *ex his iam eris homines capunt*, by the labours of those first Masters and their Successors. Say therefore, was the draught of fishes great, and all cryed a Miracle, And the draught of souls out of perdition far greater, and nature only did it? No certainly. Belieue it, Had the Pastors of Christs Church toyled only by that weak instrument of humane knowledge, the Idols of the Gentils would yet have stood, and all of them might well have bemoganed their lost labour with S. Peter. *Magister per totam noctem laborantis nihil cepimus*. Master all night long, we have been hard at work, and got nothing.

humane learning, was able to convert souls.

The draught of souls out of perdition, miraculous.

Magister per totam noctem laborantis nihil cepimus.

3. And here briefly (to say a word in passing) is the unreason why our modern Sectaries are so weakly in any conversions,



Of parien-  
lar Conuer-  
sions.

uerfions, not only of Heathens, but of others alfo named Chriftians, to their new Religion. They launch forth, 'tis true, but without commiffion, and therefore work not by the virtue of Chriffs command, wit alone and a little wordy learning doe all, make a noife, and their books to fwell, but draw none of iudgement to them, vnles liberty and a rich Benefice (two powerful Preachers to corrupt nature) catch fome. The thing is euident, for where haue we fuch fignal conuerfions wrought by Sectaries without hope of any worldly fortune, as now (to omit ancient times) our very dayes, and late ones too, shew vs? Where haue they one like that Generous and learned Queen *Chriftina* of Sweeden, who quit a Kingdom to become Catholick? Where haue they fuch a Prince as yet liues, the grand Turks own Brother, not only Catholick, but more, a Religious man of Blessed S. Dominicks order? Its needlefse to giue you in this place a Catalogue of many German Princes, true members now of the Roman Catholick Church, who were not gained by any worldly motiue to abandon Heresy (as they haue done) but ftrongly called on by Gods grace, without delay obeyed the fummmons, as now lately did that great Commander in France Count Marifhal Turene, whose glorious Conuerfion witneff his Profeflion of Faith, was grounded on ferious thoughts relating to Eternity, and not vpon any humane intereft. Thefe very few, but great changes, before our Eyes with others innumerable known to the world, are plain effects of fupernatural grace, and manifefly shew, that more than wit or humane knowledge had a hand in them.

Catholick  
Religion  
miraculous-  
ly propaga-  
ted, therefore  
true.

Hence I argue, That Religion is from Cod, and therefore true, which He concures to, and propagates by his fpecial grace and virtue? The Chriftian Catholick Religion only, hath been thus propagated by Gods fpecial grace and virtue, therefore it is true. To add more weight to this argument, I ask whether thofe Conuerfions wrought by the Apostles them felues are to be held miraculous, that is about

about the force of nature, or not? If you deny, blot out those words of the Gospel, as most vntrue Mark 16. 20. *Dominio cooperante &c.* Our Lord cooperating with them, and say all Apostolical conuerſions were wrought by natural cauſes only, And grant next, Mahometiſm and Chriſtianity thus far equal, that as Mahomet driues all to his belief, by the ſword (the cauſe is natural) ſo the Church drawes all to it by wit, policy and humane learning, and this means is altogether as natural: Now if you ſay thoſe firſt Conuerſions were truly effects of grace, and wrought by Gods ſpecial aſſiſtance, This ſequelle is Clear: The like made in after ages by the Church, far more numerous, as difficult and wholly as glorious, proceed from the ſame fountain of Goodnes, Gods Diuine grace and ſpecial Aſſiſtance. And note, I ſpeak here of real Conuerſions, wrought in Belieuers vpon ſolid motiues (the Church ſhewes you millions of them) not of hypocritical changes pretended for God and Religion, when worldly intereſt has a hand in them. Theſe are as ſoon diſtinguiſhed by their falſe luſtre, as a comet from the ſun, they laſt not long, but fall like blaſing ſtarrs. We meddle not with them. Thus much of a ſhort digreſſion which makes way to an other *querie*, and 'tis as followeth.

hypocritical  
Conuerſions,  
not Valuable.

# CHAP. V.

*Whether all called Chriſtians Belieue intirely Chriſt's ſacred Doctrin? And whether meanes be afforded to arrive to the knowledge of true Chriſtian Religion?*

- THEſe queſtions largely handled in the other Treatiſe, are ſoon reſolued vpon certain Principles. I ſay therefore firſt. All called Chriſtians belieue not truly and intirely Chriſt Sacred

30 Disc. 1. C. 5. *all called Christians, beieue*

Sacred Doctrin, and proue it; If Hymenæus and Alexander Timoth. 1. c. 1. 20. once true Believers made shipwrack of their Faith; if the Arians Monothelists, Pelagians, Donatists, and such known Hereticks named Christians, haue fallen also, and lost true belief of Christian verities sufficiently proposed? This sequel is euident. All of them though named Christians, haue not Faith intirely good, nor indeed any Diuine Faith at all. See the other Treatise Disc: 3. c. 3. n. 4.

*Means  
sufficient to  
know true  
Religion.*

1. I say. 1. All and euery one may with ordinary diligence come to the knowledge of the true Christian Religion; I proue the Assertion. Diuine Faith, without which we cannot possibly please God, is determinatly necessary to saluation; and consequently the Religion where true Faith is taught, is also necessary. Therefore both these after Ordinary diligence used may be known; vnlesse we wil say, that God first makes such things necessary to saluation, and then remoues them so far out of sight, that none can know by prudent ordinary diligence what these necessary things are. I say *necessary to saluation*, not to dispute with Melchior Canus and others of the necessity of faith to the first iustification of a Sinner. This difficulty we waue, and Argue. 2. God as we now suppose with all Christians, yea with Iewes and Turks also, is the Author of true Religion, which he reuealed to the world, for no other end but mans happines, and eternal saluation, therefore if he desires all to be saved by true Religion, which is the final end therof, He cannot, vnles his Prouidence fail, but afford means to know where it is professed, otherwise (which ill becomes an infinite wisdom) he would set vs all on work to gain Heauen by the belief of true Religion, and withall leaue vs so in darkness, that we cannot with all prudent industry, come to the knowledge of it; which is to say, He will haue vs know the end of Religion, and yet conceal the means leading to the knowledge of it.

3. Again I argue. 3. God who obliges not to impossibilities, laies a strait command on all to beieue true Religion (and not to assent to any fals sect) therefore it may be known, and clearly distin-

distinguished, at least from the errors of infidels, Jewes, and Turks. Known I say, but how? Not by its internal light immediately, for no Religion euer yet was its own self-evidence *ex terminis*, or prudently got admittance, because the Professors of it Cryed it vp as true. Therefore the credibility of true Religion, which must be laid open to Reason by force of Conuincing motives, is made as well discernable from Heresy (destructiue of saluation) as from Turcism, or Iudaism, yea, and may be no lesse clearly discovered by its proper signes and lustre than a true Miracle; for example, that of S. Peter, from Simon Magnus Sorcery. This cannot be denied, vnles God, as I now sayd, either command's impossibilities, viz, to find that out, which cannot be found, or liceneth vs to embrace any Religion called Christian, whether good or bad, true or fals (it imports not) because the best, if it can be found, is no more but a meer Probability, or like vncertain opinions in Philosophy, which may be reiected or followed according to euery priuate fancy. This execrable Doctrin of the indifference to any Religion, learned in the Diuels schoole, is now a daies much in the mouths of many, and, I fear, too deeply rooted in the hearts of some later Sectaries. But of this more here after. In the mean time you may conclude. If true Religion be in the world, its made discernable not only from Iudaism but Heresy likewise; and if it haue this *discernibility* it can be known, if known, it induceth an obligation to be believed with Diuine Faith, if it grounds certain Faith *Subiectiue* taken in him that belieues, it is no Opinion, and considered *Obiectiue* it implies the highest certainty Imaginable, settled on God's Revelation as is largely proued in the other Treatise. Disc. 1. c. 5. n. 6. 7.

True Religion is not its own selfe evidence.

Not a thing indifferant.

CHAP. VI.

## CHAP. VI.

*Of our Seſtaries error in their ſearch after true Religion. As alſo of Mr. Stillingfleets inconſequent way of Arguing.*

1. **O**Ne error common to all condemned Hereticks, is in the firſt place to find out true Religion by the book of holy Scripture alone. A moſt improbable way, as the ancient Tertullian learnedly obſerves lib de Preſcrip. cap. 9. 15. but chiefly cap: 19. at thoſe words often cited. *Ergo non ad Scripturam provocandum &c.* The reaſons of my Aſſertion well pondered are moſt convincing, 1. The Seſtary laies hold of a book which he ſayes teaches truth, and yet knowes not in his Principles nor ſhall euer know *infallibly*, whether the book he own's contain's the Doctrin of true Religion, or ought to be valued as Gods aſſured word, which is to ſay in other terms, He learn's infallible truths of a Maſter, before he hath infallible certainty of this Maſters teaching truth, *infallibly*. That the Seſtary wants infallible aſſurance of his book is evident, for he ſaith, no word of God, written or vnwritten, no infallible Tradition, no infallible authority on earth, aſcertain's him of the *Scriptures Divinity*. So Mr: Stillingfleet in ſeuerall places chiefly part 1. c. 6. Pag 170. Therfore he, can haue no in fallible Aſſurance of the Doctrin contained in Scripture, and conſequently no Diuine Faith grounded on that Doctrin, as I ſhall ſhew hereafter. How euer, grant him an indubitable aſſurance in a general way of ſome books of Scripture, hee hath not yet ſo much as moral certainty of that preciſe Canon he receiues, excluding other books which he denies as Scripture, For no Orthodox Church, no vniuerſal Tradition, no conſent of Fathers, no definition of any Council, approoves his Canon, or explodes thoſe books reiected by him, therefore the ſeſtaries Canon, wherof

*Seſtaries  
haue not  
infallible  
aſſurance of  
their Bible.*

wherof there is so Much doubt, can give no moral assurance of Gods revealed verities, vnles it were without dispute a liquid truth, that their Canon only is Gods word, which cannot be supposed, whilst so learned and numerous a multitude of Christians oppose it, as defectiue and imperfect. Yet more. Suppose he gives you the exact number of Canonical books, hee gain's nothing, because the very Doctrin of these books is no more but a Translation; and therefore vnlesse the Translator or Printer, haue faithfully complied with their duty, and preserved the books in their ancient purity, no Protestant can assure himself or any, that what we now read, is without change or corruption, pure in the very necessary points of Faith. If you say you compare them with the ancient Original Copies of the Hebrew and Greek; I answer the very best Originals men can light on now, are no more but meer Transcriptions, and consequently may haue been corrupted by the Transcriber, the Printer, or Librarian. Therefore the Sectary hath no Moral certainty of the bare letter in Scripture, if he cannot shew vs the hand writing or Autograph's of the Prophets and Apostles, wherof there is no danger; because he neuer saw any. Hence I argue. He who hath not infallible certainty of the very letter of Scripture, want's infallible certainty of the Doctrin contained in Scripture, but the Protestant hath no infallible certainty of the letter of Scripture, Therefore he want's infallible certainty of the Doctrin contained in Scripture for no certainty of the letter, no certainty of the Doctrin draws from thence. But if he has not certainty of the Doctrin he can haue no infallible faith grounded on it: Therefore Scripture alone is an vnmeet means to teach him, whar either true Faith, or Religion is.

*The best  
Originals  
now extant,  
are only  
transcrip-  
tions.*

*An argu-  
ment against  
Sectaries.*

2. Mr. Stillingfleet to solve this vnanswerable Argument Part. 1. c. 6. p. 196. saies, we beg the Question, when we require an infallible Testimony for our believing the Canon of scripture, yet grants such a certainty, as excludes all possibility of reasonable doubting. and Chap. 7. p. 211. declares himself further thus. Give me leave to make this supposition, that God might not haue given this supernatural Assistance to your Church, which you pretend makes it infallible; whether



men through the vniuersal consent of persons of the Christian Church in all ages, might not haue been vndoubtedly certain, that the Scripture we haue was the same deliuered by the Apostles? I answer, if you take leaue to make that supposition, licence me to tell you, you haue not that certainty of Scripture which Diuine Faith both supposeth and requires. And here is one reason (to omit others insisted on here after) Deny this infallible assurance of the books of Scripture, you haue no greater certainty, that God endited those words we now read, than you haue assurance that Aristotle wrote his Topicks, or Cæsar his Commentaries; And dare you, or any say, that we receiue our Bible vpon no surer ground? Or can you imagin, if Christians accept these books vpon a Testimony lesse then vndubitable, it may not be suspected that a thousand gross errors haue entred the Copies by the negligence, or inaduertyency of such as transcribed them? Believe it. Were Aristotles Topicks matter of Diuine Faith, none would dy after the fallible conueyance of them to our age, vpon this perswasion, that nothing substantially first writ by that Author, hath been changed or altered Since; and the same I assert of the Bible; vnlesse you say that the words of Scripture were writ in some celestial and incorruptible Matter, yet to be read by all; or grant, which is truth; that as God by special Prouidence caused them to be writ pure, so also he yet preserues them without blemish, and now witnesseth the truth by the Testimony of his infallible Church, wherof more largely hereafter. At present I will only answer your difficulty about that fallible certainty, which you affirm, excludes all possibility of reasonable doubting, and say first. The vniuersal consent of persons of the Christian Church in all ages, neuer approued the intire Canon of your Scripture: for not only the present Roman Catholick Church, but the ancient councils also, receiued books which you reiect. This truth is so manifest that it need no further proof, therefore your Canon want the approbation of the whole Christian world, and consequently you haue not so high a certainty of Scripture, as excludes all possibility of reasonable doubting. I answer. 2. And it is a demonstration against Protestants, who say the whole Christian world for a thousand years

Mr. Stilling:  
answer, dis-  
satisfactory.

years at least, err'd in Doctrin contrary to the verities of Holy Scriptures, for, if we goe up from Luther to the 4.<sup>th</sup> or 5.<sup>th</sup> age after Christ, you'll find none but condemned erring Hereticks and Roman Catholiks, no lesse actually guilty (say Sectaries) of these professed errors: Of *praying to Saints*, of an *unbloody Sacrifice of Chr.*, the *real presence* &c. Thus much supposed, I both answer and Argue against you. If the whole Christian world was for that vast time so strangely insatuated, as to maintain errors contrary to Scripture, when the true Doctrin therof no lesse concerned their eternal Salvation, then the true letter, it cannot possibly be supposed vpon any weak Probability (much lesse on such a certainty as excludes all reasonable doubt) that these besotted Christians preserved the letter of Scripture pure and intire, whose errors are now imagined most gross against the Doctrin contained in God's word. Observe my reason. It is much more easy to conceiue (if all held corrupted Doctrin) that the very letter of Scripture was by negligence or ignorance of these Corrupters of Doctrin, also corrupted, then to imagin the records preserved pure, and Millions of Christians to read them, and after the reading, grossly to mistake Gods verities registred in that book. And here I must mind M. Scillingfleet of his proofless and inconsequent way in Arguing.

3. You Sr. say first. The whole erring multitudes of Christians before Luther preserved Scripture pure, yet forsooth, these silly men taught one Doctrin after an other, contrary to Scripture. They perused the book interpreted it, yea preached it, to their own confusion, and condemnation. You say, 2. It is not possible that these writings could be extorted out of mens hands by fraud or violence vnder their eyes, or suffered to be lost by negligence: Yet you make it not only possible, but grant the Doctrin therof to haue been lost and peruerted by fraud, negligence, violence, or all together. You say, 3. These ancient Christians were professed enemies to the corrupters of the Bible: yet you hold them dear friends to the deprauers of Gods verities, registred in the Bible. You say, 4. The interest of eternal Salvation made these Christians careful to preserve the Bible in its first integrity: And yet you make

*A further  
Argument  
taken  
from the  
papists sup-  
posed errors*

*Mr. Scilling-  
fleet's argu-  
ments  
retorted*

them supinely careless in preserving the verities contained in Scripture, as highly necessary to salvation. You say, 5. The eternal concerns of all Christians so depended vpon the safe preservation of these Sacred Records that if they were not true, we are all most miserable. And I reply. The eternal concerns of all Christians as highly depend's on the pure Doctrin of Scripture as on the outward secured Records; for what avails it to haue pure Records, and draw poyson out of them? You grant the whole world was miserably infatuated with false Doctrin for ten whole ages, though it had the letter of Scripture pure, and yet the purity of that book preuented not the misery of mischieuous errours. You say, 6. When once I see a whole Corporation content to burn the publick Charter, and substitute a new one in its place, and this not to be suspected or discovered; When I shall see a Magna Charta foisted, and neither King nor People be sensible of such a cheat, when all the world shall conspire to deceive themselves and their Children: I may then suspect such an imposture as to the Scripture, but not before. Answ. Ex ore tuo te iudico, and retort the Argument in your own words. When I see not only a whole Corporation but a whole ample learned Church, waite or depraue the old Legacy of Christ sacred Truths bequeathed to it, and a new learning substituted in its place, and this change not to be suspected and discovered: when I shall see that *Magnum Depositum* of his Doctrin once committed to the Church, escape to be foisted, and neither King, nor Prelate, nor People found, sensible of the cheat: when all the world shall conspire to deceive themselves and their children by teaching fals Doctrin in place of Christs verities: Then I shall, and must in prudence suspect an imposture, a change, an alteration in the very booke of Scripture. This later you shamfully grant to haue happened, when vpon the pretence of hideous errours you abandoned all other Christian Societies in the world, and vnfortunately made a Schisma with Luther from the true Roman Catholick Church, therefore you may not only weakly suspect, but must most iustly fear the first, which is, that you haue not true Scripture.

4. Hence I say, what euer Argument proues the booke of Scripture hitherto preferred pure, proues likewise the Doctrin of the present

And further  
urged  
against him.

present Church as faithfully transmitted and Conveyed pure from age to age to our very dayes. Contrariwise, if there were any Principle (as there is none) whereby this Doctrin could be shew'd false or stained; All might (if reason have place) joyntly acknowledge a non-assurance of the Scriptures purity; For that Church which may lose true faith and Corrupt Christ's Doctrin, may more easily lose or corrupt Christ's Scripture, unless you grant, which is horribly impious, that Gods special Providence had only care to keep a Bible incorrupt; and at last like one careless, permitted the Doctrin of that book (whereon Salvation essentially depend's) to be extorted out of the hearts of all Christians for a thousand yeares together. Ponder these truths Mr. Stilling: and Confesse ingenuously, if your Principles hold good, you have not so much as any probable certainty of your Bible.

*An inference  
from what is  
said.*

*Corrupters  
of Christ's  
Doctrin may  
more Easily  
Corrupt the  
words of  
Scripture.*

3. Perhaps one may say if the letter of Scripture be corrupted the very foundation of Faith is shaken, but if supposed pure and unaltered, though all Christians, Papists, and Hereticks erred in the Doctrin thereof, yet they may be reclaimed from error by the pure Evangelical preachers, now swarming in England. Pitiful, what no help then for a besotted world before these late men appeared, who here speak at random? They first tell vs upon a meer *supposition* without any semblance of proof, that Scripture was ever preserved pure though all Christians abused its Doctrin; whereas we contend upon most grounded reasons, that if all erred in the doctrin drawn from Scripture, the letter cannot be supposed pure, because a Church carelessly negligent in the preservation of Christs Doctrin, cannot be thought careful enough in preserving the true Records of his Doctrin: Now the Answer without proof is, though all erred Doctrinally, yet none of them maimed or marred the Bible, which besides a Moral impossibility, implies a pure begging of the Question. See more of this particular in the other Treatise Dist. 2. c. 2. n. 8. Again..

If these Evangelical men pretend to Convince vs of our errors *What* by a pure book of Scripture, they are obliged to shew vs some *testimonies are* one Copie at least, whereof we may have such certainty as *obliged to.*

If God  
assisted the  
Transcribers  
of scripture  
much more  
he assist's  
the Church.

cludes a Possibility of all doubting. But this no Protestant can do, who rejects all editions now extant except perhaps his own. The Vulgar latin, which Mr. Stillingfleet calls the great *Diana of Rome*, of high credit in the Church for a thousand years, pleaseth not. The *Clementine* and *Sixtine* Bibles, not different in any Material point touching Faith, are undervalued. Set these aside, I desire Mr. Stillingfleet or any Protestant, to show me a Copy, whose Authenticalness is so agreed on by the consent of all Christians, as may exclude reasonable doubting of its purity. It is utterly impossible. If these men answer, we must have recourse to the *Autographs*, or ancient *Manuscripts* of the Hebrew and Greek, I deny their supposition, for these now extant, are no first Originals, in a word no more but Transcriptions. What greater security therefore, have we of such copies then of the Vulgar latin? unless you say that the Transcriber (who ever he was) because he wrote *Hebrew*, *Caldee*, or *Greek*, could not tell a lye, or was determined to follow in every Material point of Faith the *Hagiographers* Copy most faithfully. Grant this, and I Argue If God by special Providence so assisted the memory, the will, and hands of these Transcribers, as to write nothing but what was exactly found in the first Original Scripture; with much more reason will He ever assist his Church to admit or approve of no Scripture, nor Doctrin, but what is genuine, pure, and Orthodox.

6. To reinforce this argument. I licence Mr. Stillingfleet to chuse amongst so many lections of the new Testament as he saith, are collected by Robert Stephen, one or two he likes best, and then I demand whether that lection agrees with the vulgar latin or differs from it? If it agree, there is no reason to quarrel with the Vulgar; if it be different in any material point, we are cast vpon the greatest vncertainties imaginable, for the dispute will then be, whether that Copie which he followes, ought to be preferred before the Vulgar Latin? And here, Sr. you and I must come to clear Principles. Wee say first. The Vulgar latin translated, or at least Corrected at Pope Damasus Command by that learned

and



*The vulgar  
Latin of long  
use in the  
Church.*

and profound Doctor S. Hierom, hath been read in the Church without reproof, for a thousand years and upward. None but one Rufinus (and this only at the beginning whilst S. Hierom lived) excepted against it. S. Austin, all know, Lib. de ciuit. 18. c. 4. 3. highly commend's S. Hieroms great labours, and learning in the three tongues. Not any in the ensuing ages found the work reprehensible: innumerable worthy Authors haue approued it. And now, O strange time! a few Nouellists whose whole industry is only to pull down, to build nothing, disdainfully call it *Romes great Diana*. Be pleased, Sr. to answer and giue me as strong a proof for the Authenticalness of that Copy you follow (if any difference be) as I giue you for our Latin Translation? If you say the S. Hierom Copy you follow is not the same which S. Hierom vsed, it is more than you know: He had as many lessons, and perhaps more, than you haue seen, and can you say which he followed, and which he did not? Well. But suppose he made vse of an other Copy different from what pleaseth you, the Question is, whether that be of lesse credit then yours? And this sole point cannot be decided in your fauour by any probable Principle. If you say, S. Hieroms Translation seem's contrary to the Authentick Greek Copies. I answer first, you do not only auouch more then you know, but utter an improbability; for if there had been any Material difference between his Translation, and the Greek he made vse of; innumerable learned Doctors in the Catholick Church would haue espied the error, and discovered it, before you were born. Pray you remember your own discours P. 215. and 216. where you say, you may be sufficiently assured that no Material corruption is in the Books of Scripture without our Churches Testimony, because Catholiks of old were alwayes as vigilant to preserue the Scriptures purity, as Hereticks ready to deprave it: For you say, when *Marcion* began to clip the Text *it new* presently took notice and rebuked him, and so did *Tertullian*, and *Ephraim* respectiue to others, who refused Scripture from the violent hands of such as attempted to falsify it. Lay then yours on your brest and once speak ingenuously, can you perswade your self, if any

*S. Hierom  
defended,  
against  
Cauils.*



*Catholic  
authors  
would have  
noted errors  
in the vul-  
gar, had  
there been  
any.*

any considerable error had been in our Vulgar Edition, either contrary to Faith or Good manners, that those many worthy learned Catholics in the ages after S. Hierom would not have noted it, and released it from Corruption? What? For a thousand years, was there no *Irenaeus*, no *Tertullian*, no *Epiphanius*, no *Ambrose* &c. that took notice of so important a matter whereon the salvation of souls depended? Again (And this Argument ever pinches) was there no *Irenaeus*, no *Tertullian*, in all those ages, (when they saw the Doctrin of Scripture go to ruin by these supposed erring Papists, that rescued the Doctrin from error, as they did the letter of Scripture from corruption?

7. You tell us. 2. That among those multitudes of lessons in the new Testament observed by Robert Stephen which were perhaps occasioned in the general dispersion of Copies by the Multitudes of Transcriptions, through the ignorance or carelessness of the Transcribers, there are none which seem material or intrench upon the integrity of Scripture, as a rule of Faith and manners. They are therefore, say you, *but racings of the skin, but no wounds of any vital part*. And is it possible? Can you find more then such racings in the Vulgar Latin? can you discover a wound in any vital part therof? I challenge you to speak to the cause in this particular, but I know you cannot. Why therefore may not the Vulgar be admitted amongst the rest? The reason of my assertion is: You cannot find such a wound in the Vulgar, unless you produce a Copy of Scripture more genuine and pure without Dispute, but this, whether you have recourse to the Greek or any Latin translation will, be more doubted of by whole multitudes of learned men, then the vulgar now read in the Church: Therefore you cannot come to so much certainty of any Scripture as excluder a possibility of all reasonable doubting. Which truth seem's so evident *ad hominem* that it needs no further proof, but this only, The Sectary faith, our Vulgar translation is not pure, we say and proue it, his English Bibles different from the Greek in the new Testament, are Corrupted, (see many of these errors noted before the Rhems Testament), Therefore if the Protestant reiect's the

now

now Authentick latin Edition he has no such certainty of any Translation extant, as excludes a possibility of all reasonable doubting, vnless he makes his own parties opinion for what he saith vndubitable and our contrary assertion improbable, which is foul play.

The vulgar Latin revised, Protestants have not Certainty of any Translation.

8. Some sectary may reply, He excepts not against the Vulgar Latin which is our *Sixtine* and *Clementine Bible*, as guilty of any Material error, but of lesser faults only, and with such charitable eyes hee look's on all other versions Thus much integrity, I hope, Mr. Stilling: allows it p: 216. where he takes notice of a peculiar band of *Diuine Providence* in preserving the Authentick Records of Scripture safe to our dayes. By the way: it's pitty he omitted to note also the like prouidence in preserving the Doctrin of Scripture pure so long: But hereof we haue said enough already. All therefore I note at present is. 1. If God shewed a particular Prouidence in preserving Scripture, pure to our dayes, the Vulgar Latin according to Mr: Stilling: Cannot be guilty of any material error, for were it guilty, this peculiar Prouidence would haue failed in the great moral body of the Roman Catholick Church, which hath read this Scripture, and held it incorrupt for ten whole ages; And Consequently Mr: Stilling: must acknowledge a want of special Prouidence in order to the preservation of all authentick Records euery where. Grant thus much; and no Sectary can haue so great moral assurance of scripture as excludes all reasonable doubting, for, if God hath permitted a whole ample Church to be deluded with a Bible notably corrupted: The Certainty of Scripture, which excludes all reasonable doubting, fail's the sectary, who either must admit of an other latin Translation distinct from ours, or haue recourse to the Greek Text, but he approues of no latin Translation as totally pure and incorrupt, (though S. Hierom obserues in his preface to the Gospels. *Tot sunt Exemplaria quot Codices*, there are many of them) Therefore He must haue recourse to the Greek, which is vidual.

Sectaries must approve the Vulgar latin Bible.

9. Hence I argue. If God shewed not particular Prouidence in preserving our latin Edition from notable error, so diligently

F

reuiued

*An Argument in  
behalf of  
our Latin  
Edition.*

by S. Hierom and approued also not only by many learned Writers in after ages, but by a whole Church; it is no lesse then temerarious to allow greater security to any Greek Copy; for can the Sectary say, that Gods peculiar hand of prouidence alwais so attended the Transcriber or Printers of the Greek Copies, that nothing could be written but pure Apostolical Scripture, and with any countenance own a want, a defect, a subtraction, of this peculiar prouidence to a Scripture, approued of by a whole Church? Obserue well the difficulty. Where Gods special Prouidence is, there we haue infallible assurance, you grant God's special assistance to those Transcribers of the Greek Copies, (otherwise the Authentick records had not come safe to our hands) therefore you cannot rationally deny it to that Scripture, which the Church approues.

## CHAP. VII.

*✚ If this digression concerning the different Editions of Scripture formiduous to the Reader, he may passe to the 9. Chapter, where he will find our Discourse Continued against Sectaries.*

*More of this subject. Doubts concerning the several editions of scripture. None extant more pure, then the Vulgar Latin. Abstract from Church Authority, there is no Certainty of the best Edition. Sectaries Comparing the Present Copies with the more ancient giues no assurance. A word with Mr. Stillingfleet.*

1. **T**He first proposition. If the Protestant reiect's our Vulgar Edition as not Authentick, or as viciated in any material point touching Faith and manners, He improbably pretend's to haue so much certainty of Scripture as excludes a possibility of reasonable doubting. To proue the Assertion I will here giue you a few *Postulata* visually held indubitable by most learned men, who haue writ large preludes ( called *Prolegomena* ) to holy Scripture. Neither Catholick nor protestant shall rationally except against my suppo-

suppositions. First it is Certain, that the greatest part of the old Testament was Originally writ in Hebrew, but whether that ancient Copy hath been euer since preserved pure, chiefly after S. Hieronims time, or notably corrupted by negligence or malice, is very doubtful. Learned men stand for the Affirmative, and none, I think, can deny some lesser errors when greater are pretended. You may see these different opinions of Authors in *Prolegomena*: Ad Biblia Maxima, And the particular supposed errors largely noted by Salmieron *Prolegom*: 4. It would be too long a work to insist on this subject, and not for me to determine what is true: All I contend for here, is an vncertainty whilst great Authors are opposite, and this is done, to conclude, what I intend against Sectaries.

*The first  
supposition*

2. It is again certain that the greatest part of the new Testament was writ in Greek, but here we meet with the same difficulty, and inquire. Whether the Greek by chance or inadvertancy has been corrupted since the Apostles time? This at least (if not more) is doubtful: Graue Authors hold the Affirmative. See Serarius in *Prolegom*: Cap. 13. and Bonfrer, c. 14. and the errors noted. If Protestants deny them, or think their own authority weighty enough to Contradict our Doctors, the matter in Controuersy, is still doubtful. So much I plead, and no more. 3. It is certain that all other Bibles are only Translations, or Transcriptions of the Original Hebrew and Greek. The Greek version of the 72. interpreters out of the Hebrew (or as wee vsually speak the 70.) is only a Translation wherein many doubts occur: One is, whether that Translation be the first, For Clement Alex: and Euseb: cited *Bib: Max*: sect. 18. c. 2. seem to hold an other more ancient, before the time of Alexander the great. How euer, admit, which is perhaps true, the 70. version to be the most ancient, we haue yet matter enough of Dispute concerning it, and one great Question is whether at this day, that version be yet preserved pure, The ancient Archetyps wherof, more probably are not now extant, but when or where lost, remains vncertain. See *Bib: Max*: sect. 18. c. 10. Authors say, it is corrupted through the ignorance or negli-

*The second  
supposition.*

*The third.*

# 44 Disc. 1. C. 7. Doubts Concerning the

The version  
of the Sep-  
tuagint.

Venerable  
Bede's Ind-  
gement.

Of other  
shrew Tran-  
slations.

gence of the Librarians, or the Printers. See Bib : Max : c. 8. 9. *Reflat ergo*. Whence it was, that those Laborious Doctors of Alcala, at the perswasion of Cardinal Franciscus Ximeno Archbishop of Toledo, and afterward, the Doctors of Louain, making a diligent search after many Greek Copies, corrected no few faults in the then extant transcribed Copy of the *Septuagint*, yet this very correction was far from the purity of that ancient version, which the Fathers vsed. See Bib : Max : now cited, where vpon that other version of the 70. taken out of an Ancient *Manuscript* of the *Vatican Library*, Anno Dom. 1585. Came forth by the industry of Cardinal Anton : Caraffa, wherein most learned men laboured nine whole years, and it was perfected about the beginning of Sixtus 5. Raighn. The greatest difficulty yet remaineth. It is most certain, the version of the 70. Interpreters differ's so notably from the Hebrew Text, chiefly in the computation of years, or point of Cronology, that our venerable Bede, though a great Scholler and one as humble as learned, ingeniously confesseth, he cannot reconcile those Antilogies. See Bib : Max : c. 8. fine. Who then can tell me when we find these lections of the Hebrew and of the Septuagint opposite to one another, which is to be preferred? Most learned men stand for the Hebrew, as many for the 70. You may see these dissenting Authors quoted in *Proleg : Bib : Max : Sect : 18. c. 11.* and how some to accord them, say, That the Holy Ghost would haue the Septuagint now to add to the Hebrew, now to diminish according to his good pleasure. See Bib : Max : cap : 8. fine.

3. But let vs proceed to a further matter of doubting. Long after the Edition of the Septuagint, came forth three other Translations made by three vngodly men. *Aquila*, *Symmachus*, and *Theodotio*. *Aquila Pontinus*, once a Gentil became Christian, but denying Christ, soon turned Iew learned the Hebrew language, and too critically translated the Hebrew into Greek, almost word for word. His spleen against the 70. Interpreters was so great, that contrary to the verity of Scripture, He rendred some places speaking of our Saniour, most perfidiously and wrested all to a confused

confused and sinister sense. *Symmachus* one of Samaria, twice circumcised became at last a Professor of the Ebion Heresy, and Translated the Hebrew into Greek, not as *Aquila* did *Verbatim*, but rendred the sense more perspicuously. *Theodotion* first Baptized, then a Sectary of Marcions and Ebions errors, lastly a Profylite, embraced Iudaism (and therefore *S. Hierome* in 3. *Habacuc* call's these three, now named, *Semi-Christians*, half Christians) followed a middle way between *Aquila* and *Symmachus* and translated Scripture with greater Simplicity, more agreeable to the 70. version.

4. An other Edition ascribed to *Origen*, not because he made a new version, but with an immense labour, to conserue the 70. Greek pure, first composed his *Tetrapla* or a Bible branched into 4. Columns. The first contained the 70. version, the 2. *Aquilas*, The 3. *Symmachus* his Translation. The 4. that of *Theodotion*. Afterward this great Doctor, learning the Hebrew language, made his *Hexapla*, that is a bible with 6. Columns. The first contained the Hebrew Text, the 2. the Hebrew in Greek Characters, the other 4. the Version of the 70. of *Aquila*, *Symmachus*, and *Theodotion*. Now because there were two more Greek Versions called the *fift* and *Sixt* Editions, *Origen* composed his *Octapla*, or Bible distinguished into 8. Columns. If you will haue more of the 5. Edition, called by some *Hierescuntina*, or of the *Sixt* named *Nicopolitana*, as also of the *Lucian* and *Hesychian* Lectiōns, read *Bib: Max: in Proleg: Sect. 18. Cap: 9. and Bonfrer. in Prol: c. 17.* These two later were only corrections of the 70. no new Translations. Concerning all these versions many doubts occur as you may see in the Authors now cited, and you will meet with no fewer concerning the Caldee Paraphras of the new Testament, called *Targum*. The Syriack version or interpretation of the new Testament extant in that noble laborious work of *Arias Montanus* called *Biblia Regia*, is not without blemish, *Se Serrar: c. 15.* nor the Author of it well known, and I belieue our Sectaries will not approue seueral Titles or inscriptions mentioning what was wont to be read on certain feast dayes, as on the

*Origens  
great indu-  
stry.*

*Doubts  
relating to  
these ver-  
sions.*



eneration of the Holy Croſs, and in certain faſts, and the Commemoration of faithful ſouls departed this life &c.

*The Itala  
verſion,  
commended  
by S. Auſtin.*

5. To ſpeak here of the many latin Editions and ſeveral doubts concerning them, would be too long work for my deſigne (which is only to point at difficulties concerning both Originals and Tranſlations) That ancient one called by S. Auſtin. *Itala*, highly commended lib: 2. de Doctr: Chriſti. and read in the Church before S. Hieroms time, hath no known Author. The more late amongſt Catholicks, are Santis Pagninus his verſion of the old Teſtament out of the Hebrew, firſt corrected by Arias Montanus, though the Correſtion pleaſeth not Bonfrerius; and it was moſt pittifully corrupted by that Runnagate Printer Robert Stephen, wherof ſee more in Bib. Max: Sect. 20. Cap: 2. and Bonfrer: Cap. 18, Sect. 1. An other you have of *Iſidore Clarus*, which neither Canus nor others approve. A third, of Francis Vatablus Doctör of Paris, and a ſound Catholick, but the vngodly Robert Stephen corrupted that verſion, as you may read in Bonfrer. and Bib. Max. now cited. I mention nothing in this place of the Armenian and Gothick Bibles. See Bib. Max. Sect. 20. cap. 3. And am as ſilent of the Tygurin verſion printed anno 1539. by Chriſtopher Froſchonerus, a moſt corrupted Tranſlation by Hereticks, (wherof you may ſee more in Bib. Max: now cited cap. 3.) Read alſo if you pleaſe Serrarius cap. 18. 9. 1. Of Sebaſtian Muſters, of Blihbanders, of Caſtalions and the Geneva Tranſlations &c. You will find none of them of any account, but with Sectaries only.

*Reſlection  
made upon  
theſe doubts.*

6 Thus much briefly premixed (for we have not ſaid half of what might be alleged) concerning the doubts and uncertainty of various editions, I here appeal to every diſtinterreſſed judgement and ask whether it be not mighty difficult, or rather impoſſible, to ſay abſolutely by the force of our priuate fallible knowledge, by witt or humane induſtry only: *This book, This Edition is Gods true ſincere word*, as it was writ by the *Hagiographers*? And here I muſt mind Mr: Stiſling: of his not well conſidered Doctrin, who P. 196. ſeems to own ſo great certainty of Scripture as excludes

the possibility of all reasonable doubting, and pag 215, asserts. *We may be sufficiently assured that there are no Material Corruptions in the books of Scripture, without your Churches Testimony.* Good Sr. I leave of these generalities, and tell vs plainly of what Edition you speak? What particuler version haue you, which must be supposed so authentick, or so free from all error, as may exclude a possibility of reasonable doubting, before you haue the Churches Testimony or toleration for it? Name one, and much is done. Will you follow the Hebrew and Greek Copies now extant? You see most learned men, whose knowledge and Authority is not inferiour to yours, say both are corrupted, and thus much alone weakens the certainty you pretend to? Will you admit of the 70. Translation as pure and Authentick? Be pleased to reconcile the Antilogies, between that and the Hebrew Text, or say that the Septuagint, though euer of great veneration in the Church, hath its errours. Will you plead for what Aquila or Symmachus haue done? These are evidently corrupted, and in points most Material touching Christ our Lord. Will you say that all Copies, none excepted, all Translations whether Greek or Latin now extant are pure Scripture in the Materials of Faith and manners? It is highly improbable, and therefore hitherto we come to no Solid Principle, to no certainty which excludes the possibility of reasonable doubting. O saith Mr. Stilling: to proue that no Material Corruptions stained the Scripture now extant, *We* (that is Sectaries) diligently compare the present Copies with the most ancient MSS. *We obserue* the citations of those ancient Fathers who liued when some Autographs were extant, and then (most likely) we haue the pure word of God. You compare? Pray you answer? were there not others in the Catholick Church before Sectaries troubled the world, as industrious in comparing Copies and Manuscripts together, as you haue lately been? Was S. Hierom, think you, negligent in this particular? Or did the Primitiue Church before S. Hierom when it read that ancient Edition called *Itala*, and preferred it before all other Lectiōns, fail to examin which Copy was best?

Yet

*A question  
proposed to  
Sectaries.*

*Of Sectaries  
Comparing  
Scripture  
with the  
more ancient  
Copies.*

48 Disc. 1. C. 7. Doubts Concerning the

Yet more. If we come to later times and ponder well, what diligence what vigilancy, what industry attended the Correction of the *Sixtin* and *Clementine* Bibles, Sectaries may blush at their Oscitancy, and too sleight Cauils at our Vulgar latin. Read the preface to Sixtus 5. Edition, Antwerp print 1599. with other reflections made in Bib: Max: Sect 20. c. 4. and you will see so great à care and industry vsed in this correction, that humanly speaking more could not be desired.

Great diligence vsed in the Correcting the Vulgar.

7. Many Copies and old MSS. were at the Popes command sought for, and brought to Rome, Not only some chief and selected Cardinals in the time of Pope Pius the 4. but other great schollers also, profoundly learned in the knowledge of Scripture, and skilful in the *Hebrew*, *Syriack*, *Chaldee*, and *Greek*, began the Correction of the Vulgar Latin, and to accomplish the work, diligently examined these ancient books, these MSS, the best Originals of Hebrew and Greek, and commentaries also of the most ancient Fathers &c. Speak therefore of humane industry, we may boldly say, our Vulgar Latin hath been reviewed, and corrected with greater care, than euer version was set forth by Sectaries. But if these men will still pretend to find any Material error in the Vulgar, I only ask by what more Authentick Copy can they, so much as probably hope to amend it? By the Hebrew and Greek? Toyes. Dispute the Question rigidly, there is lesse assurance of these supposed Originals integrity, then of the Vulgar Latin so industriously examined not only by the best Hebrew and Greek Copies now extant, but also by other ancient MSS. and commentaries of the Fathers.

Doctor is mes opposed.

8. I cannot therefore imagin what Mr: Stillingfleet aims at, when he tell's vs page. 215. that Doctor James who had taken the pains to compare not only the *Sixtine* *Clementine* Bibles, but the *Clementine* Edition with the *Louain* Annotations, makes it appear, there are 10000. differences in the *Louain* Annotations from the Vulgar Latin, and that these differences arise, from Comparing it (that is sure the Vulgar Latin) with the Hebrew, Greek, and Chaldee- What would the man haue think yee?

Will

Will he suppose first, that Thomas James hits right in every thing he saies? The learned James Gretser whose authority is every whit as good the whole world over as that of Mr. James. Tom. 1. Ad lib. 2. Bell: pag. 1060. denies all this, with à *Mentitur* *terrid* *Thomas James, Decem milia verborum &c.* Read Gretser I cannot transcribe all he hath. Again will he say, that the Vulgar Latin is to be corrected by the Louain Annotations, or these by the Vulgar, if any thing were amiss in either? Or 3. If these pretended differences arise from the comparing all with the Hebrew, Greek, or Chaldee, can Thomas James be supposed to know the *last energy* and force of every Hebrew, Greek, or Chaldee word (when there is controuersy) better then the Authors of the Louain, and Correctors of the Vulgar Latin? Here we may come to an endles wrangling about the Genuine signification of words, but decide Nothing. God help vs, if the knowledge of true Scripture depend's on such petty Nicities, and fruitles quarrelling. 4. And this is to be noted. Were these differences more then are made by Mr. James, The question would then be, whether they imply any Material alteration concerning *Faith or Manners*, or introduce notable errorr contrary to God's reuealed verities, or finally bee meer verbal differences, grounded on the obscure signification of Original words? If Mr: Stilling: only pretend's this later, let him remember his own expresseion of *rascings of the skin*, and know, that there was neuer Translation in the world, which may not be thus Cauilled at. If any Material alteration be pleaded he both speaks à lowd vntruth, and contradickt's himself, when he takes notice of à peculiar hand of Diuine Prouidence in preserving the Authentick records of Scripture safe to our dayes. 2. He is to name that Authentick Copy, either Original or translation, by the indisputable integrity wherof, these supposed errors may bee cancelled, and Gods pure reuealed verities put in their place: But to do this after so immense labour and diligence vsed in the correction of the Vulgar, will proue no lesse than à vain attempt, or rather à desperate impossibility. Vpon this ground.

*Rational  
exceptions  
against Mr.  
James.*

G

9. 1. say

An Assertion  
proued.

9. I say first. Who euer denies the Vulgar Latin to be Authentick true Scripture, hath, *eo ipso*, lesse assurance of any other Edition now extant, and consequently, not so great certainty of Scripture as excludes a Possibility of all reasonable doubting. I proue the Assertion. That man may rationally doubt of Scripture who rejects the strongest assurance imaginable, and makes choise of a weaker, But this is done, if he doubts of, or denies the Authenticalness of the Vulgar. The reason is first because He hath no other Edition, as is now said, examined with more care or greater industry, and this ground's the highest humane assurance conceivable. 2. Because the Vulgar is approved by God's Holy Church which giues infallible certainty, if therefore the integrity of the *Hebrew*, and *Greek* be not vnquestionably authentick, he wants that certainty which excludes a Possibility of doubting. And Much less assurance hath the Sectary of his own later iarring Editions of Scripture, which breed nothing but confusion to the very Authors, and all who read them.

What if  
lesser faults  
be pretended  
in the  
Vulgar.

10. I say. 2. If the Sectary hold's the Vulgar Latin Authentick Scripture, yet makes it guilty of some lesser faults, and therefore endeauours to correct it by a more authentick Copy, he cast's himself vpon meer vncertainties and, labour in vain. The reason is. To doe thus much, he must suppose that other Copy he would correct by, to be more pure than the Vulgar, and this cannot be proued vpon any received Principle. Now if you obiect. Authors Commonly deny not some obscurities or lesser verbal faults to haue been in the Vulgar, I answer that's nothing to the purpose were all true, for it doth not therefore follow, it can be corrected by any other Copy which is more Authentick Scripture, A lesse authentick Bible may help herein, when other lessons are accurately examined, yet may be faulty in greater matters.

11. I say. 3. No Tradition no Testimony which is fallible and may be fals, can giue so great assurance of Authentick Scripture as Diuine Faith requires, or that assurance which ex-

cludes

cludes à possibility of reasonable doubting, which is to say in other words: The infallible Testimony of the Church is absolutely necessary to ascertain vs of Authentick Scripture. The conclusion is directly against Mr: Stilling: who page 226. makes the certainty Christians haue of the books of Scripture so fallible, that it may be false, yet enhaunses the certainty of the Doctrin there contained to à note higher, of infallibility. We shall see the leuity of this distinction fully discouered hereafter, and our Assertion proued in à more proper place: All I will say at present, is. No man can be certainly assured of true Scripture vnles he first come to à certainty of à true Church independently of Scripture. Find out therefore the true Church and we haue all we seek for, I mean true Scripture with it, vnles one tend's to à high degree of madnesse and Assert's, that the true Church of Christ cheated into an erroneous Bible, was deprived of pure and authentick Scripture.

*A Testimony in fallible, is necessary to ascertain Scripture.*

12. And here I will propose an Argument for the Vulgar Latin which Mr: Stilling: shall not answer. In what euer Society of Christians we find faith intirely true, we haue there Authentick Scripture: But from Luthers time vward to the 4. or 5. age faith intirely true, was only found in the Roman Catholick Church, and in no other Society of Christians, Therefore the Roman Catholick Church which read so many ages the Vulgar Latin as Authentick, had true Scripture: I proue the Minor, wherein only is difficulty. If the Roman Church erred for so vast à time in any point of Diuine Faith, there was no faith intirely true the whole Christian world ouer, because all other Societies denominated Christians were known condemned Hereticks; and consequently had not true faith, Therefore either the Catholick Roman Church enioy'd that blessing, or we must grant à want of faith for ten ages the whole world ouer. But if this Church had Faith intirely true, it preserved also Authentick Scripture (for where true faith is there you haue true Scripture) If not; it follows that wee haue no assurance at all either of the one or other. Therefore if all

*An argument prouing the Vulgar Latin Authentick,*



Churches vniuersally erred in points of faith; no Church can giue so much assurance of authentick Scripture, as excludes a Possibility of reasonable doubting. See more here of in the other Treatise Discours. 2. c. 2. n. 8.

*A difficulty  
proposed, and  
solved.*

¶ 13. Now we are to solve a difficulty which may arise from our former discourse, where 't is said. If one rely on humane authority which is fallible and may be false, so much mistrust, so many doubts occur concerning the Originals and various Editions, that none can haue indubitable assurance of Scripture; How therefore could the Church without moral certainty (and greater too) had of the Authentick books, antecedently to the Councils declaration, determin so peremptorily, this Edition of the Vulgar to be Authentick, yea and to prefer it before other *Latin Copies*? I might here first by the way demand, vpon what certainty can the Sectary prefer his Edition (take which hee will) before the Vulgar Latin? What euer moral assurance he has independently of the Church's Testimony for his Bible, the Church has greater for Hers. But to solve the difficulty positiuely. I say the Church after all moral diligence, proceeded in this particular vpon an vdeniable Principle, which is, that God by special Prouidence preserved as well Scripture free from Material corruption, as Church Doctrin pure and orthodox: in both, wee Catholiks rely on peculiar Prouidence, and all must do so, vnless they, will rob Christ's Sponse of all the treasure she has, and violently take from her not only Orthodox Faith, but Scripture also.

*The Catho-  
like Princi-  
ple ascer-  
taining  
Scripture.*

The Church therefore in her Declaration depended not on a meer Moral fallible certainty, which may be false, but vpon *infallible Tradition*. This gaue indubitable assurance of the Scriptures purity, free from all material errour. Here is her last Principle. And thus you see a vast difference between the Church and Sectaries. The Church plead's possession of Authentick Scripture vpon Gods gracious Prouidence, and hath it warranted by indubitable Tradition, the Sectary reiect's this infallible ground, and run's away, with no man knowes what Certainty, and in doing so, cast's himself vpon the greatest doubts imaginable concerning scripture.

14. Perhaps

14. Perhaps you will say, Mr: Stilling: p. 213. relies in this matter on the vniuersal consent of all Christians, and Therefore includes the Testimony of the Roman Catholick Church. I answer first. Hee hath not the consent of this Church for all those Editions He approoves, and Consequently the greatest part of a vniuersal consent fail's. I answer 2. He neither doth nor can (remaining Protestant) admit of the Catholiks surest Testimony or Tradition, for our Church own's in this most weighty matter, an infallible certain Tradition, Mr: Stilling: reiect's that, therefore he hath nothing from our Church which fauours his Assertion, drawn from the most assured consent of all Christians concerning Authentick Scripture. And here by the way, I cannot but take notice of this Gentlemans weightles obiection Pag. 216. who grants, there can be no certainty as to the Copies of Scripture, but from Tradition. *But think not to sob vs off (saith he) with the Tradition of the present Church instead of the Church of all ages, with the Tradition of your Church, instead of the Catholick &c. with the ambiguous testimonies of two or three Fathers instead of the vniuersal consent of the Church, since t's Apostles times* Answ. I verily perswade my selfe He speak's not as he think's, for tell me vpon what surer Principle can men now possibly be better informed of Church-tradition in all ages, then by the tradition of the present Church? You see, He slight's the Testimony of two or three Fathers (needed we relief from them) and I am sure the vnanimous agreement of all Fathers makes no where the consent of the Church in all antecedent ages, contrary to our present Churches Tradition. From whom therefore shall we learn? On what vndubitable Principle can we rest, or say such was the Tradition concerning Scripture in pas't ages but from the present Churches Testimony? It is impossible to pitch on any other Proof which is surer, or half so sure.

*Testimonies  
Cannot rely  
on the  
Churches  
infallible  
Testimony.*

*The surest  
principle to  
know  
ancient tra-  
dition,*

15. What followes is yet worse. *Fob vs not off with the tradition of your Church instead of the Catholick.* Good Sr. designe you, or name plainly that Catholick Church distinct from the Roman

94 Disc. 1. C. 7. Doubts Concerning the

*A weak  
Argument  
rejoiced.*

Catholick in all ages, and (to vse your own words) we shall extol you for the only person that euer did any thing memorable on your side; but if you do not this, as I know you cannot, (for all other before Luther were professed Hereticks) tis you that luggles and fob's vs off with meer empty words. He still goes on thus, worse and worse. *If I should once see you proue the infallibility of your Church, the Popes supremacy, Invocation of Saints, the Sacrifice of the Masse &c. by as an vnquestionable and vniuersal tradition as that is, whereby we receiue Scriptures, I shall yeild my self as a Trophy to your braue attempts.* Contra 1. ad Hominem. *If I should once see you proue all Churches fallible, the Pope no supream head, No Invocation of Saints, no veneration of Images, no Sacrifice of the Masse &c. and the rest of your negatiue Articles: If I could once see you proue two Sacraments only, Institution by faith only, Christs not real presence in the Holy Eucharist, by as vnquestionable and vniuersal Tradition as that is whereby Scripture is receiued, we would yeild also to your braue attempts.* Answer this if you can, or for bear hereafter to weary a reader with euidēt improbabilities. And mark well why I call them so.

*Tradition  
more and  
Lesse  
vniuersal.*

16. Haue we not a more vnquestionable vniuersal Tradition for the books of Scripture, if Tradition be drawn from the voice of all called Christians (whether Catholicks or Hereticks) then there is for the very primary Articles of true Catholick Faith? *A Trinity for example, the Incarnation, the necessity of Grace, Original sin &c.* Yes most assuredly, for innumerable Sectaries admitted Scripture, and yet denyed these essential Articles, therefore as their Denial made the consent and tradition of all called Christians lesse vniuersal, for such Doctrins, so their admitting Scripture with others, heightned that Tradition, or made it more general. Say now, Sr. Had those Hereticks argued as you do, how little would they haue gained? *If I should once see you proue a Trinity, Or Original sin &c. by as vnquestionable a Tradition as that is whereby Scriptures are receiued, we would acquiesce* but this is not possible, for both you and wee admit Scripture, and consequently *make that tradition more vniuersal, yet we den*

your primary Doctrins, and therefore all tradition is not so ample for your Doctrins, as for the books of Scripture. Here is your vnreasonable reasoning Mr. Stilling: You know well Hereticks who owned Scripture with vs, denied à *Sacrifice of Mass* *Inuocation of Saints* and other Catholick Articles, and you'l haue vs to take à tradition from these men, to vphold the Doctrins they denyed: Iust as if an Arian should bid me proue à Trinity from all Tradition, even of his Church, when he admit's Scripture and denies à Trinity. If you reply, you vrge vs not to bring in the tradition of all known Aduersaries of the Catholick Church for these now named Articles, but only the vniuersal Tradition of the Catholick Church in all ages, we haue already answerd, that's best known by the present Churches Testimony, no other proof can parallel it. And thus much of the Authenticalnesse of our Vulgar Edition free from all material Corruption. A further difficulty may yet be moued concerning lesser faults, and the preferring it before all other Latin Copies.

An vnreasonable way of arguing.

## CHAP. VIII.

*How necessary it was to haue one lection of Scripture in the Church. A word of the Sixtine and Clementine Bibles. Of Mr: Stillinfleets mistakes and inconsequences concerning them. Obiections answered.*

1. **N**Ote first. It was very meete to haue among so much confusion and various lections of Latin Copies, one certain, approued and set forth by the mother Church, to the end her Children might be *ynim labij* of one tongue and speak one

One lesson  
of scripture  
necessary.

one language in their reading, preaching, and publick expounding Holy Scripture. Note. 2. Though the Council of Trent self. 4. declares this Edition of the Vulgar to be Authentick, and preferre's it before all other latin Editions, *Qua circumferuntur*, which are now abroad, it doth not thereby detract any thing, from the credit and authority of the ancient Hebrew, and Greek Copies, whereof Authors dispute (whether they be pure or no) whilst the Church is silent and defin's nothing. Neither doth the Council reiect the Version of the Septuagint, or that ancient Latin Copy called *Itala*, (read in the Church before S. Hierom) as *Vnauthentic*, in any material point: for this Argument is conuincing to the contrary. As it is madnes to say. Christs Church had not true Scripture since S. Hieroms time, so is it à desperate improbability to assert, She wanted that, in the ages before S. Hierom, which is to say: The Church had euer authentick Scripture. Moreouer, shall we (think yee) iudge, that God, whose Providence neuer failed, suffered his own spouse to be beguiled with false Scripture for 15. ages, and that now towards the end of the world he will provide vs of à purer book, by the hands and help of à few scattered Sectaries.

The Church  
had in all  
ages true  
Scripture.

2. Note 3. Translations may be faulty three wayes chiefly. 1. More ambiguity and darknes may lye in à translated word than in the Original, and this fault (if any) is remediless, because the latin, or à Vulgar language teacheth not alwaies the full Energy and signification of an Hebrew or Greek expression, wherof you haue some examples in that learned Preface to the English Rhems Testament anno 1600. 2. Corruptions may creep into à Version by the inaduertancy or ignorance of the Translator, who is neither supposed prophet nor infallible, and thus Authors say, that S. Hierom, though prodigiously learned, was not euery way infallibly secured from lesser errours, yet this Providence God hath for the good of his Church that he will not permit any considerable deprauation to remain in all Copies. If therefore one be faulty, all cannot be thought so, and the faults of one, by carefully comparing it with

How Trans-  
lations may  
be faulty.

with many, and à diligent inspection into other Copies; may be corrected. See Greg. de Valent: lib. 8. Anal. C. 5. punto 4. 3. *dy Lesser depravations often enter à version through the mistakes of Printers Librarians &c.* Of these you had many in the Vulgar Latin before the correction of the Sixtine and Clementine Bibles; and they are scarce avoidable chiefly after several reimpres-  
 sions, as we daily see in other books. Thus much premised.

3. Listen à little to Mr: Stilling: strange inconsequences and groundles exceptions against the Corrections of Sixtine and Clement. He saith the one Bible differs from the other, as appears by those who have taken the pains to Compare them, in some thousands of places. A great number indeed. But the first question will bee whether these Pain-takers ought to be believed upon their bare word, without further examination? This, Sr. you suppose which cannot well pass, before the particulars come to the test, and bear the censure of your Adversaries, wholly as learned as you have any. But say on. Are these supposed differences any more but like the *rasings of the skin*; or do they giue any *mortal wound to the Vital parts of Scripture*? If you only assert the first, you may not only Cavail at your English Bibles, but also at all the latin translations used in the Church both before and after S. Hieroms time, for they have some verbal differences, which you may call petty and inconsiderable faults. Now, if you assert that the Sixtine and Clementine Bibles are *materially corrupted in points of Faith* and manners, or to use your phrase, *Vitally Wounded*, what is become, I beseech you, of that peculiar hand of Providence you own, in preserving the authentick Copies of religion safe to our dayes? Or (which much imports you to answer) by what other more authentick Copy can you without endless disputes and uncertainties, correct the Vulgar? This one particular will giue you work enough, before you come to à certain decision of the difficulty. In à word, because I think, many know not too well, all that concern's these two Editions of the Sixtine and Clementine Bibles, I shall add here à few notes to improve their knowledge, and perhaps your's also.

H

4. Learned

Of Mr.  
 Stilling's  
 groundless  
 exceptions.



4<sup>th</sup> Learned men; discovered lesser faults in the Vulgar Latin; and that which was found. 4. Regum c. 14. v. 17. seemed a chief one. *Vixit Amasias filius Ioas Rex Iuda, postquam mortuus est Ioas filius Ioachaz. Regis Israel 25. annis.* For thus the Louain Bibles anno 1572: and other Copies usually read 25. annis, before the Correction of Sixtus. Yet Abulenſis upon that place. Quest. 15. noted the error; and said for that number 25. wee are to substitute 15; as appears. 2. paralip: c. 25. And so also the Hebrew text, the Septuagint and Chaldees read, yet Michael Paludan: cited *Proleg. ad Bibl. Max: Socet. 20. c. 4.* seems to reconcile both these lections, saying Amasias liued 25. yeares after the death of Ioas, but reigned only 15. which helps little to our present purpose. To amend this, and other slighter faults, the Church, as I said above, and you may read in the preface to the Sixtine Bibles, hath vsed the greatest industry imaginable. Pope Pius the fourth caused not only the Original languages; but other Copies to be carefully examined. Pius the 5.<sup>th</sup> prosecuted that laborious work; but brought it not to a period, which Sixtus the 5.<sup>th</sup> did, who commanded it to be put to the Press, as appears by his Bull which begins. *Aeternum ille celestium* &c. anno 1584; yet, notwithstanding the Bull prefixed before Sixtus Edition (then printed) this very Pope (as the preface made anno 1592. tell's vs) after diligent examination found no few faults slip into his Bible, by the negligence of the Printers, and therefore, *Censuit atque decreuit* both iudged and decreed to haue the whole work examined and reprinted; but his too sudden death preuented that second correction, which Clement the 8.<sup>th</sup> after the short reign, of other Popes happily finished, answerably to his Predecessors desire, and absolute intention. Whence it is, that the Vulgar now extant, is called the Correction of Sixtus because this Vigilant Pope began it, which was recognised and perfected by Clement the 8.<sup>th</sup> and therefore may be deservedly called the *Clementine Bible* also. Both are now read in the Church after Clement's Recognition as authentick true Scripture, and made vp the Latin Vulgar Edition.

How Cor.  
rected by  
Sixtus and  
Clement.

5. Some

Some object first. If Pope Sixtus made a *Brient*, whereby he commanded his Edition so accurately recognized, to be received for indubitable authentick Scripture, and therefore free from errors, How could he afterward find such faults as caused him to intend a new impression of the whole work? Answer: It is not said, He intended to do so upon the account of greater faults; which essentially vitiate Scripture either in *Faith* or *manners*, for No substantial error mention is only made in the Preface of lesser *errata's* Espied, when the work was done with this restriction, *Prelis vitio*. That is, of Typographical faults, and these almost unavoidable, cannot stain the purity of an authentick Copy. But grant more; that Sixtus who had Choice of various lections of Scripture, followed perhaps lesse circumspectly some darker or more ambiguous Copy, which Clement the 8.<sup>th</sup> after a diligent search into other Editions, brought to greater Clarity, and therefore read's a little differently. Nothing is yet so much as probably alleged, causal of any error in *Faith*, or Contrary to the essential verities of Scripture. For as *Tannerus* well observes Tom. 3. Disp. 1. 9. §. Dub. 2. n. 79: Where diuers lections vary, *locum esse positū disceptationi & crisi*. There may be place for Criticks to debate, which is the best, or to be preferred, And n. 83. *Certe, fuit he, in hoc genere transigendo etiam inter limites recti, magna potest esse varietas & latitudo*. Certainly, in such kind of matters, there may be well be variety and a latitude, within the compass of what is right and true. And this Principle Sectaries must admit, unless they deny truth to their own Translations, as they ought to doe. For do not they vsually translate *paradoxis*, *Ordinances*, we; *Traditions*. They *persecutores*, Elders, we Priests. They *idola*, Images, we Idols? And is it not euident that we follow the obvious and genuin signification of the Greek, as well in these as in a number of other particulars? Whilst therefore Sectaries differ from vs, they either err or, not, if they err; let them correct what's amiss, If contrary to conscience they deny the error, they are forced to grant that, *inter limites recti*, within the limits of Truth there may be a latitude, a variety, or difference

Variety of expressions with in the Compass of truth.

rent expressions, and you will not find so much between Sixtus Edition and that of Clement, nor any Corruption destructive of Faith or manners, but slighter differences only, which alter not the genuin sense of Scripture intended by the Holy Ghost, if wee exclude Typographical faults, which hinder not the integrity of a *Person*.

6. Upon these grounds, Mr. Stilling: objections pag. 214. Come to nothing, where he first tell's vs, and truly, of the infinite pains which Pope Sixtus took in his Correction, and after So much ado, shall we (saith he) believe that Sixtus neuer lived to see his Edition Compleat? Answ: You must believe it upon humane faith, for it is certain, God took him out of the world before he saw it perfect, though his intention and aime was, to recall the whole work to the press again. Now this Recognition, His Successor Clement made, answerable to his wish and design. Mr. Stilling: objects 2. Sixtus his Bull now extant (and therefore sufficiently proclaimed) inioins that his Bible be read in all Churches without any the least Alteration. Answ: This Injunction supposed the Interpreters and Printers to haue done exactly their duty every way, which was found wanting vpon a second reuiue of the whole work, such commands therefore when new difficulties arise, not thought of before, are not like Definitions of Faith, unalterable, but may, and ought to be changed according to the Legislators prudence. What I say here is indisputable, for how could Sixtus after a sight of such faults as caused him to intend an other impression inioyn a retention, when He desired one, and what he could not do, his Successor Clement the 8.<sup>th</sup> did for him. Now whether the Bull was sufficiently proclaimed, matters not, for had Sixtus lived longer, He would as well haue changed the Bull in order to the particulars now in controversy, as amended his Bible.

6. Mr: Stilling: objects. 3. All that Sixtus pretend's for the Authenticalness of that Edition, is the agreement of it with the ancient and approved Copies both printed and M.S.S. than which there can be no more firm or certain Argument of the true, and

genuin

Mr. Stilling.  
flours  
objections,  
solved,

ge  
wi  
Th  
pro  
in  
wh  
Ed  
by  
of  
and  
as T  
so  
tion  
truth  
befor  
that  
corre  
that i  
thing  
he a  
dance  
seruic  
8.  
Clemen  
the V  
places  
Answ  
Who  
Editio  
differ  
reading  
rent, an  
and so f  
Contra

genuin-Text. Answ. After all his labour He pretend's this, but with a caution often repeated in the Bull, *quodcum fieri potest: prout optime fieri potest* &c. That is as well as then could be &c. The firm or certain Argument therefore is. The Church ever preferred true and Genuin Scripture, which is either to be found in the ancient approued Copies both printed and *manuscripts*, or no where. These, Pope Sixtus diligently searched into, therefore his Edition is true genuin Scripture, which no Catholick denies, if by true and genuin Scripture we vnderstand, not an Exclusion of all lesser faults, but of greater contrary to the purity of Faith and Religion, and so far Sixtus Edition is blameless, although as Tanner now cited. n. 83. obserues, perhaps not altogether so circumspcctly done, nor euery way fit to the publick edification of the Church, *Wherin there is a latitude within the Compass of truth, and integrity.* And who euer read's Pope Sixtus own Bull before his Bible, can force no more out of it but this truth, that many faults which had got into other Copies, are accurately corrected in his Edition, wherof no man can doubt; with all, that it contains the Vulgar Latin Edition amended at least in many things, and consequently is authentick Scripture. Sixtus saith not, he amended all lesser faults wheron Religion has no dependence, but rather disclaimes busying himself with so small a seruice.

How and  
what Sixtus  
pretend's.

Many faults  
amended by  
Sixtus

8. Mr: Stilling: obiects 4. The vast difference between the Clementine and Sixtine Bibles lay in this, that Clement corrected the Vulgar Latin according to the Original in about two thousand places, when the contrary reading was established by Sixtus. Answ: Here is no proof but only three improbable Assertions. Who assures you, Sr. of any vast difference between these two Editions? Or inform's you so exactly of about two thousand different places? Or, why finally do you tell vs of a contrary reading established by Sixtus? A reading, Good Sr, may be different and yet not contrary in any material point of faith or manners, and so far Sixtus is defensible. If there be any other difference or Contrariety not touching on Faith and Religion, because the expression

No Contrary  
Reading in  
Sixtus his  
Edition.

pression is longer or shorter, lesse clear in the one, and more significant in the other version, this concern's vs not, both may be right within the compass of truth, and without any material fault.

But saith Mr: Stilling: if the Latin Copies be à sure Rule to iudge of the authenticalnesse of the Text by, much more shall the ancient Copies of the Original Hebrew and Greek be à surer Rule.

Answe: Had we now the authentick true Copies of the ancient Hebrew and Greek we should soon acquiesce, but Sectaries know well, this is more then doubtful, yea almost certain that both are corrupted, how far I say not, but morally speaking the Hebrew

The Hebrew  
text, ly  
able to Cor-  
ruption.

cannot but be corrupted by reason of the great similitude in many letters, and the access of points added by the perfidious *Majoreths* after S. Hieroms age, which may change the sense of Scripture, and very notably. See *Greterus Defens. Bellar.*

*Tom 1. lib. 2. c. 2.* I wonder why Mr: Stilling: is so earnest for the Greek, which our English Sectaries vtterly leaue when 'tis for their purpose. I haue told you enough already of *Images*

translated for *Idols*: *Elders* for *Priests*: *Ordinances* for *Traditions*, &c.

And might add more, that *Beza* thinks those words *τὸν Κανὸν*

*Luc. 3. 37. of Cainan* to no purpose in the Text, and therefore leaues them out. Others when the Vulgar Latin makes for them

follow that, and not the Greek: Take only this one instance (*Authors giue many more*.) The Vulgar reads *Rom 8. 37. certum*

*sum enim* I am certain: The Greek *τίςτις* *yaq* for I think, or am probably persuaded. Now some to assure themselves of their

Predestination, read I am certain, with the Vulgar, not I am persuaded as the Greek doth. It would be endles to tell you of

Luthers ill dealing with both the lections of Greek and Latin. After the wicked man had perfidiously added that particle, *Solum*,

to those words *Rom. 3. 28. per fidem*, and read by faith only. He omits whole sentences of Holy Scripture in his Translation, &

that. *Mark 11. 26. If you will not forgive, neither will your Father that is in Heauen forgive you, your sins.* 1. *Thess. 4. 5. That you abstain from fornication*, is wholly omitted by him, and that whole

sentence also 1. *Ioan. 5. 7. There are three that bear record in Heauen*

8c. You will find no such Grofneffe in either the *Sixtine* or *Clementine* Bible. Yet more. Luther is excellent in the mincing or changing the proper signification of words *Isay*. 9. v. 6. to please the Jewes, where the Hebrew Text giues the name of God *El* to Christ and the Greek *ὁ θεός* Luther read's in Dutch *flaffe furitudo*. To lessen the Blessed virgins plenitude of grace, whereas the Greek *Luc*. 1. 28. read's *Κεχαρισμένην* properly full of grace, Luther puts a Dutch word, which as I am told, signifies one *pretty well gracious* and no more. You haue an other notable corruption of the Greek Text *Galat*. 3. 10. But enough of these abuses, I cannot prosecute half of them. See *Tan*. *Tom*. 3. pag. 319.

9. Mr: Stilling: last obiection is a flat Calumny. The Pope, saith He, took where he pleased the marginal Annotations in the Louain Bible and inserted them into the Text. Answer. who would not when he read's this disingenuous and fraudulent expression, *Where Hee pleased*, but iudge, that the Pope without more Adoe pick't what he list'd out of the Louain Annotations, and made that Scripture at his pleasure, which is an open slander. In a word here is the truth. Those worthy Doctors of Louain with an Immense labour placed in their margents, not their own Annotations or Comments, but the different Lections of Scripture, yet determined not which was best, or was to bee preferred before others, for they well knew, the decision of such causes belongs to the publick iudicature, and Authority of the Church. The Pope therefore, omitting no humane diligence compared Lektion with lection, and those lections, (which vsually differ most inconsiderably, or very little, as I haue often obserued in perusing the Louain Bibles). Clement made vse of, and after mature weighing all, preferred that which was most agreeable to the ancient Copies. And here is all Mr: Stilling: Cauils at, which yet was necessary to be done, to haue one vniform Lektion of Scripture in the Church approued by the sea Apostolick.

10. Some may yet object. We say the correction of Sixtus though in some things faulty contains nothing material contrary to

*A Calumny.*  
*for an*  
*obiection:*

*Anobiection.*

to



to Religion or manners: Clements Correction is only so far faultless and no farther, for many hold both these Editions may yet be corrected in some less and slighter *errata's* occasioned by the Librarians or Printers. Nay, perhaps it is not yet in every particular most perfect, Therefore Clements pains was to no purpose, or amended little in the Sixtine Bible. That these lesser *errata's* are found in both Copies, and may, if the Church please, be yet corrected, is granted by great Authors. Read the Proleg. ad Bib: Max: sect. 19. C. 8. Gretser. Tom. 1. lib. 2. Defens. Cap. 11. Bell. Salmeron. Vega. And others quoted in Bib. Max. Answ: The Preface before the Sixtine Bible reviewed by Clement, and Sixtus his own Bull, giue ground enough to solue this difficulty. The preface declares the Edition of Sixtus and Clement to be corrected *Quamā fieri potuit diligentia*, with as great diligence as could be then vsed: yet to say it is absolutely perfect every way, respecting humane weaknes, is difficult. However it is to be preferred before all other *Latin Copies* set forth to this day, as the most pure, and better amended Copy. Again, 'tis said. *In hac perusina lectione sicut nonnulla consilio mutata sunt &c.* In this Vulgar Edition, there are many things purposely changed, so there are others which seem to be changed, left on for purpose, without alteration. And you may see four reasons hereof in the following words of the Preface, Pope Sixtus his Bull speak's as clearly. *Neg: enim ignoramus scire &c.* We are not ignorant, but that there are many who thought, a few words and locutions of this Latin Edition might haue been translated by the Latin interpreter, more properly, more elegantly, more perspicuously, or more copiously, measuring, as it were, with words. *Verum de his, minuta nimium & angusta concentratio datur.* But to insist on these, seems a strife too minute, or word little. *Neg: enim tanti sunt &c.* Neither are they of such consequence, but that the Religion of the ancient Church, and the Authority of most holy Fathers ought to be preferred before such Niceties it being vnmeet and vnworthy, as S. Gregory saith. *Ut sub diuina regula verba Calesti oraculi restringantur.* That the words of the Heavenly Oracle be tyed to the layes or rules of a Grammarian.

Thus, and much more Pope Sixtus. And hereby you see the weaknes of the obiection proposed. Sixtus corrected many faults in the old Vulgar Latin anciently vsed in the Church ( Sixtus neuer said, He corrected all the lesser errata's ) Clement purged it of more, and restored that ancient Copy ( so far as diligence could do ) to a *greater integrity*. Was not this work laudable and praise worthy in these two worthy Prelates? Neither of them can be taxed of any error introduced contrary to faith, or the purity of Religion, And we vrge Sectaries to speak a probable word against our Assertion.

11. By this and the precedent discours you may learn first, that Mr: Stillingfleet speaks at random when he tell's vs p. 213. of an abundance of Corruptions in the Vulgar Latin, and yet cannot find so much as one Contrary to Faith and Religion. You see. 2. He amuses and abuseth an ignorant Reader; whilst he asserts there are some thousand of places wherein Sixtus and Clement differ. There is no difference at all in any one point, *that's essential or material*, other differences which arise, either from the Printers errors, or diversity of Lectons, as long as we read what's true and the Church approves, is neither lyable to Mr: Stillingfleets Censure, nor can be iustly blamed. You see. 3. That when Mr: Still: talk's, of Thomas Iames his comparing the *Sixtine, Clementine Bibles*, with the Louain Annotations, and then mentions ten thousand differences from the Vulgar Latin, which differences arise from the comparing it with the Hebrew, Greek, and Chaldee, He vnderstand's not Matters too well. Because neither Sixtus nor Clement were obliged to regulate themselves by the *Hebrew, Greek, or Chaldee* Their industry only being to correct the old Latin (*Itala*) Lecton, called by S. Gregory *the ancient Translation* (most Authentick Scripture) which, howeuer was done, both after a diligent search into the Hebrew and Greek, and a careful inspection also into other Copies. And here by the way, you may perhaps discouer a piece of Mr: Stillingfleets cheat, about the ten thousand differences mentioned aboue. Be pleased only to peruse the first words, of Genesis where you will find a different sound of words. The Vulgar read's

*The difficulty, solved.*

*Not one Corruption, in the Vulgar, Contrary to Faith.*

*What these two Popes chiefly intended.*

*In principio creauit Deus Calum & terram*, and so it is in the Chaldee and Samaritan Copies. The Roman septuagint: *In principio fecit Deus*. Others ascribe this Lesson to the 70. *Deus creauit in principio*. Some out of the Hebrew read *Creauit Iudices*. Aquila read's. *In Capitulo fecit Calum*. The Syriack. *Creauit Deus esse Cali & esse terra*. An other Syriack. *In sapientia Creauit*. The Arabick. *Primum quod creauit Deus fecit Calum &c.* Others, *Creauit Elohim & Calos*. Others for *in Principio*, read, *cum Principio*. All which imply no more but meer triuial verbal differences, and these perhaps with many like them through the whole Bible, made Thomas James number swell vp to then thousand. Most petty and pittiful doings, whilst nothing appear's of greater consequence. If any desire à literal exposition and reconciliation of these and other lessons through the whole Scripture, He may peruse the Author of *Bibl: Max*: Comprehending nineteen great volumes. You see, 4. If the Church had true authentick Scripture before the corrections of Sixtus and Clement (wherof no man euer doubted) shee has it still after the Council of Trents approbation, much more free from *lesser faults*, than formerly. You see, 5. If the Sectary reiect's the Vulgar Latin now corrected, he has no such assurance of any true Bible in the world, as excludes à possibility of doubting the Scriptures integrity, and consequently, that Scripture serues him not to find out true Religion, or build true Faith vpon with security. You see. 6. that all the exceptions sectaries make against the Correction of Sixtus and Clement, vltimately examined, empty themselves into no more but only into slight, torpid, and inspid Calumnies, vnworthy men of iudgement and literature. You see. 7. the Sectaries Carping at euery thing, is iust like him who said. *Quicquid dixeris impugnabitur*. Had the Church not at all corrected these lesser faults, the sectary would haue blamed it as negligent, and looking to nothing, now it has done that good Seruice, it is found fault with. so it is. *Quicquid dixeris impugnabitur*. Help it who can. I say God help them who find fault, where there is none. If any desire to haue à solution to some other Silly difficulties against the pretended solæcisms and Barbarisms of the Vulgar, let him

Lessons  
seeming  
different are  
not alwaies  
different,

Our sectaries  
Spirit.

him read Gretser now Cited. Bib. Max. sect. 19. C. 4. and Ser-  
rarius. C. 19. quest: 143. And thus much of à digression.

## CHAP. IX.

*Proofs demonstrating that Protestants haue not so much  
certainty of Scripture, as excludes à possibility of  
reasonable doubting. A word of Mr: Stil-  
lingsfleets weak discourse with à  
Heathen*

**L**ET vs if you please suppose, that wee and Sectaries had  
now in our hands the very Autograph's of the whole Bi-  
ble, as it was once writ by the Prophets and Apostles, or if you  
would rather, Imagin the book drop't down from Heauen pure,  
and euery way incorrupt. I say the Sectary has not probable  
assurance of Scripture, much less such à certainty as excludes à  
*possibility of reasonable doubting.* The ground of my Assertion is  
this vndeniable Principle owned as well by Protestants, as Catho-  
licks. Viz Scripture solely considered according to the exterior  
letter, vnless the true sense intended by the Holy Ghost be had,  
is no Scripture to the Reader. For example: Because the Arian  
reads that sacred truth. *My Father is greater then I,* and stand's  
merely vpon the bare sound of words without the sense intended  
by the Holy Ghost, Hee hath no true Scripture. Whence it is,  
that S. Austin serm: 70. Temp. hold's Hereticks most vnhappy,  
because they take the *words without the sense*, haue à *body without*  
à soul, the bark without the sap, the shell without à kernel &c.  
S. Hierom alio in cap. 1. ad Gal. v. 11. speak's to this purpose.  
*No posuimus* &c. Let vs not think, that the Gospel lyes in the words  
of Scripture but in the sense of those words we read, not in the  
*outside* but in the pith and marrow of it. There is no need of

*words  
without the  
true sense,  
no Scripture!*

quoting more Fathers. The Principle is agreed on by all, and most indubitable.

2. Hence I argue. Nothing is more essential to scripture than the sense deliuered by the Holy Ghost: but the Protestant, where he is most concerned, has not so much assurance of the sense intended by the Holy Ghost, as excludes a Possibility of *reasonable doubting*, and I proue it. He is most concerned, when he opposeth our Catholick Doctrin and stand's vp in defense of his own opinions, but in neither has he such an indubitable assurance of the Scriptures sense, as excludes a possibility of reasonable doubting, and this I say is euident, For he cannot haue so much assurance if as weighty, yea a far more weighty authority contradict's his sense. But it is clear that not only the present Roman Church, but other particular Churches in former ages reputed Orthodox, contradict that sense the Protestant draws from Scripture, (when he opposeth Catholick Doctrin or defends his own singular opinions) Therefore he has not so much certainty of the Scriptures sense, as excludes the possibility of *reasonable doubting*. Now, that the sole iudgement of our present Catholick Church (to dispute the thing no higher) is as great vpon all accounts, as the iudgement of Protestants, seem's undeniable; And that the Testimony of our Church weakens the assurance of that sense of Scripture which Protestants lay claim to, is most euident, as wee see in school opinions (when contrary to one another) for no man, whether Philosopher or Diuine, can prudently hold his opinion so certain as excludes a Possibility of doubting when as many, wholly, as learned yea more learned and numerous, after a full knowledge had of it and long Study also, deny that certainty. Thus much I say is euident. Now if the Protestant tells vs, the Authority of his party weakens as much that sense wee make of Scripture, as the contrary iudgement of our Church lessens his, I answer. The reply here is to no purpose For all I proue at present is, that he want's this certainty, whether we haue it or not, is another question, and clearly decided for the Catholick cause in the other Treatise. Disc. 2. c. 9. *per totum*. Again, were all granted the ob-

But Sola-  
ries haue no  
Certainty of  
the sense.

Obi-  
ction

tion would haue. Thus much (which is most fals,) only followes, that neither of vs know assuredly the sense of Scripture, which touches not the difficulty now in controuersy.

3. My 2. Argument is so demonstratiue that if the Protestant will please to solue it, He neuer trouble him more with difficulties. To propose it clearly, know only thus much. That when the sectary read's Scripture and would haue it to his purpose, He either ouer reaches the Text, or fall's short of its meaning. For example. To those words of S. Math. *This is my body* he adds this, as good sense. This is *a signe, or figure only of my body*. Mark well: We both read the same words, but Catholicks deny that to be Scripture, not because we deny the words, but his sense we say is no scripture. To that of our Sauour. *I am with you alwaies to the end of the world*. He adds, I am with you alwaies by a fitting, But no infallible assistance: We say this is no Scripture. To that of S. Iames. *A man is iustified by works and not by Faith only*, He adds, he is iustified *not before God, but before men*, we still deny this to be Scripture. And thus sectaries proceed with vs in all other controuerted Texts of Holy writ. Whence I argue.

A 2. Argu-  
ment. most  
Conuincing.

These Additions of *a sign only*, of a fitting Assistance, of iustification before men &c, are either the true sense intended by the Holy Ghost or Sectaries fancy, but most euidently they are not the sense intended by the Holy Ghost, for this must either be gathered out of so many expresse words of Holy writ which is prodigiously false, or must arise from the Holy Ghosts *infallible assistance* whereby Protestants, as people Illuminated aboue all others giue vs the true meaning of Scripture, and this besides the Paradox, when a whole learned Church contradict's the assertion, is most destructive of the Protestants own Principle: For they say, the Holy Ghost interpret's by none, enlightens none, teaches none to deliuer the true sense of Scripture, but such as do it infallibly, which Truth is most vndoubted. They say again, when they giue the sense of Scripture, or interpret God's word, they do it *so fallibly, that it may be false*, or if they interpret infallibly, and cannot err, *Eo ipso*, they are so farr infallible, which they vterly deny. See Disc. 2. c. 9. n. 8. what

Sectaries  
glosses and  
additions;  
not scripture.



then remains but that the sense of Scripture proposed to vs by such fallible Teachers, is only the thought of their own fancy.

No more are  
their deduc-  
tions.

5. Some may reply. Protestants after long perusing Scripture, and comparing seuerall Texts together, iudge the sense of these and other controuerted places by à lawful deduction, to be as they declare. I answer first. They shall neuer come to so much as à probable deduction, and I earnestly prels them to make their sense good in the passages alleged, when we now stand to Scripture only. I answer. 2. such dark inferences drawn from comparing Texts together not grounded on the very words, euer imply à mixture of humane discourse, which therefore is fallible and may be false. Whence it followes, that Sectaries can belieue none of these senses by Diuine Faith, because the last Motiue or formal object of their Assent, is à fallible reasoning only, and this may erre. And here you may learn how necessary an infallible Interpreter of Scripture is, without which we are cast vpon meer vncertainties, and vnauoidable improbabilities.

Not on: an-  
cient Father  
Clear for  
your fancy.  
The reason  
is giuen.

6. The Sectary may yet answer. To the comparing of Texts together, He add's the sentiment of some Fathers for his sense: I say of some, for t'is euident He hath not all, much lesse the Vniuersal consent or Tradition of the Church in every age. If this be the reply, I may well oppose it in Mr: Stilling: own words pag. 216, *Think not to job vs off with the ambiguous Testimonies of two or three Fathers instead of the vniuersal consent of the Church since the Apostles time &c.* But what will you say, if he has not one clear Testimony of à Father for him? I boldly assert it, and vrge him to produce but one. The reason is. What-euer Testimony of à Father is alleged for his sense, will be at most (if't come thither) so notably ambiguous that weighed with all circumstances, it may well haue à Catholick meaning: That sense therefore must stand good without contest, when it answers to the iudgement of à whole learned Church, and the Sectary hath nothing to draw it to his particular opinion (neither vniuersal Church nor vniuersal Tradition) but only à few ambiguous words capable of interpretation, and his own fancy to boot. Nay I say more, He hath not so much as any kind appearance

appearance of ambiguous words for his sense. Pray you tell me, (and let Protestants shame me if they can) where has he any hint of a Fathers doubtful words for his mind's *sitting assistance* only allowed the Church, Positiuely excluding *infallible assistance*? For *iustificacion by Faith only*? For *two sacraments only*? For a *signe only* of Christs presence in the Eucharist? yet these senses he vend's as the genuin meaning of the Holy Ghost, without proof or probability, therefore fancy only plaies here. And thus you see the first part of my Assertion demonstratiuely proued viz. That Protestants haue not so much as a weak probable assurance of that which is the very *life and essence* of Scripture, I mean, of the true sense intended by the Holy Ghost: Yet you know Tertullian saith. Lib. de Præscript. cap. 17. *Tantum veritatis obstrepsit adulter sensus: quantum & corruptum Stylus.* A fals sense depraues Scripture as much, as if the words were corrupted. Thus much premised and so fully proued, that sectaries cannot return a probable answer, I'll add one consideration more to confirm what is said.

*Tertullian's  
indgement.*

*A Discourse between a Heathen and a Christian.*

7. Imagin that a well disposed Gentil Philosopher half perswaded of the truth of Christian Religion, addresses himself to the most knowing Protestant, or Arian (and not to dissemble the force of the Argument) to some learned Catholick also. He find's them strangely deuided about their Canon of Scripture, about their Translations, and which is to our purpose now, at high difference concerning the meaning also. The Arian tell's him he hath the true sense, so doth the Donatist, the Protestant, and Catholick likewise. The wise man is not so foolish as to belieue any of them vpon their bare word, although Stentor-like they cry, this and no other is Diuine Doctrin. Therefore he concludes, if reason may haue place, This way of finding what he would know, without the help of some other Principle distinct from Scripture, and the fallible Assertion of particular men opposite to one another, is so

*How men  
called.  
Christians  
differ about  
scripture.*

The  
Heathens  
Discourse.

so highly dissatisfactory and wholly insufficient, that it cannot settle him in the truth of Christianity. Nay, he may wel argue further. If I, yet no Christian, cannot so much as know these very books to bee Diuine because *you say they are so*, when we Gentils and Iewes (in part) hold them only humane; If I though I own them as Diuine, can learn from none of you, what they say (for I find you all at high contradictions about the sense) How will you induce me by this your Bible only to become Christian? Or, how can you when you dispute with one another, so much as propose à probable Argument out of Scripture in behalf of your different Tenets, For none of you yet know by Scripture only the true meaning of it? You first suppose à sense and then argue, whereas you should clear the sense and proue it, or your Argument fall's to nothing. For example. The Protestant find's in Scripture, that the Holy Eucharist is called *Bread*; supposing Bread to signify *natural bread* or at most bread deputed to à holy vse, the Catholick denies this supposition, and sense also. Hee reads again in S. Iames c. 4. *There is one Lord-giner and iudge who can destroy and free.* Ergo saith the Protestant, there is no other visible iudge in the Church to end Controuerfies. As odd an inference as if one should conclude, because it is said in Scripture. *Be not yee called Masters for your Master is one, Christ*, no other ought to be called Master, and therefore this sense and supposition is also denied. And thus it must needs fall out, whilst the Sectary has not one express word of Scripture for his nouelties, whereas, saith the Gentil, the Texts seem clear enough for Catholick Doctrin taken in an obuious sense, yet not so clear, but that à peeuish Glosser may peruert all by his wilful fancy.

The  
Heathens  
Arguments  
Clearly pro-  
posed against  
Sectaries.

8. Yet the Gentil Argues. You Christians say, there is true Religion amongst you, and that God, the Author of it, hath allowed means abundantly sufficient to know it, Means I say whereby not only Gentils, Turks, and Iewes, but Arians and other Hereticks also, may be reclaimed from their errours. Thus much you must grant, or say that Christ hath left an vnbelieuing world vnder an impossibility of being conuerted. And if this be true, that is, it meanes be wanting to know the verities of Christian Religion, The

The

The Gentil may blamelesly remain as he is, and so may the Turk, Jew, and Heretick also. Now saith our Heathen. 'Tis evident, Scripture alone without further light, is no meet means to reclaim any of them, for the Gentil slights your whole Scripture, and can that by it self draw him off his contempt? Again The Bonzij in that vast Kindom of China pretend to an other Bible, writ long since by their supposed great Prophet called *Confusius* (and the book is not like the Turks Alcoran stuffed with fooleries) but as I am informed, some who liued long there, and knew the language well, say, it contain's most excellent moral precepts tending to the preservation of iustice and à Ciuil life. The Jew denies the new Testament, The Arian and others the sense of our Scripture. How therefore can Scripture alone proue efficacious to conuert these aliens from Christ, or be supposed à fit means obliging all to beliene, when yet they know not without more light what they are to believe, or why? An other way therefore must be found out, whereof more afterward. In the mean while.

9. I truely stand astonished, when I consider how pittifully Mr: Stilling: endeauours to solue this most conuincing Argument. Read him who will. Part. 1. Chap. 6. from page 175. to P. 179. and he shall find him rediously running on, but ner'e à whit more forward in his iourney where he ends, then at the beginning. 'Tis all à long à pure *Petitis principij*, and worse. The Question moved, is, How the Protestant can conuert à Heathen, or proue infallibly that the Bible is Gods word. Mr: Stilling: Answers, his Lord Primate vndertakes not this task in the first place, nor offer's to Conuince à Heathen that the Bible must be infallibly belieued to be Gods word. No, but first, the excellency and reasonableness of Christian Religion Considered in it self is to be proued, by shewing, that the precepts of it are iust, the promises such as may induce any reasonable man to the practise of those precepts, that the whole Doctrin is very wisely contriued, that nothing is vain and imprudent in it, that those things which seem most hard to beliene in this Doctrin are not such things, as might haue been spared out of it, as though God did intend only to puzzle mens reason with them. And thus he goes on in his draught,

Mr Stilling:  
sues resurrex  
no probable  
Answer.

K

or

He makes  
à meer sup-  
position his  
Proof.

or *Idea* of Christianity, and so proues the Truth of Christianity by telling à Heathen, *What it is*, or what it teaches. The Heathen most iustly except's against These proofs (so may à Christian too, if no more be said) and professes all this talk hitherto besides à meer begging the Question, seem's to him à pure cheat, and fallacy. You proceed strangely, saith the Heathen, for what is à supposed verity amongst you Christians, you turn into à proof against me that denies your supposition. You labour to take my difficulties away, by proposing to me those very things, which cause them. Mark well. You first make the excellency and reasonableness of Christian Religion in it self à fit medium to proue Scripture Gods infallible word, whereas that supposed reasonableness of your Religion, is as dark and obscure to me, who am no Christian, as the infallibility of your Bibles Doctrin. Therefore you proue one vnknown thing by an other wholly as much vnknown. I deny both your Bible and reasonableness of your Religion, proue the one or both, or you speak not one word to the purpose.

Evidence  
of Credibi-  
lity laid  
forth to rea-  
son before  
beliefs.

10. You suppose. 2. à Principle which neither Catholick nor protestant euer yet owned. viz. That, that which you call *Christian Religion* is known *ex terminis* to be true by à meer declaration of its Doctrin, whereas no Doctrin, euen the most Primitiue was euer made discernable from error by à bare saying it was true, without some precedent Evidence of its credibility laid forth to reason: And therefore you are told in the other Treatise against Mr: Poole. 21. That if Christ and his Apostles had appeared in the world, and only preach't the high Mysteries of our Faith, or spoken as you do, of the excellence and reasonableness of its precepts, or promises, without further evidence, they would haue no more drawn Iewes or Gentils to their Doctrin then twelue little Children could now draw vs to the belief of many other verities, (not yet reuealed) had God inspired them to teach witho ut miracles, or any other supernatural wonders. My reason is. As the Bible evidenceth not it self to be Diuine scripture, so the *intrinsicall reasonableness* of Christianity is no first evidence to it selfe, both therefore must bee proued by Clearer Principles. Belieue it. Had Christ

his Apostles only insisted vpon the *reasonableness* of Christianity, the very Iewes would haue silenced them alleging greater preuious eu-  
 dence for their Religion, shewed by Moses and the Prophets.  
 3. Saith the Heathen, because you dare not meddle with the mo-  
 tues of Credibility which you Scornfully call à *Grand Salad* too of-  
 ten serued vp by Papiests you speak at random, when you giue me no  
 other satisfaction to my difficulties than by telling me, they are  
 worth nothing. You Affirm. 4. Nothing is impertinent in Chri-  
 stian Religion. I answer. The belief of à Trinity, of God *made an*  
*tusant*; Your whole story of à Serpent tempting Eue, and of Samp-  
 son, with your Mysterious book of Apocalyps, seem to my *hu-*  
*mane vnderstanding* not only impertinent, but improbable. You tell  
 me: 5. of Christian Religion agreeing with those books you call  
 the Bible, That is, you would say, the Christian Doctrin of the  
 Bible agrees with the book, which is *idem per idem* and therefore  
 highly dissatisfactory, vnless you proue both the Bible and Doctrin  
 by further Arguments. You say 6. The Heathen ought to belieue  
 some thing besides that, he hath heard or seen vpon the report of  
 honest men. He answers, he doth, so farr, as those reports  
 moue him to assent, and therefore denies not the matter of *fact*.  
 that there was once such à person in the world as Christ, but  
 because you say all this Testimony is no more but moral, and  
 may be false, the Heathens belief goes no higher. Iust so the Turks  
 belieue there was such à man as Mahomet, the Chineses such à  
 man as *Confusius*, but what get we, by iudging there were such per-  
 sons as these in the world? Doth it here vpon follow, all they taught,  
 was true or infallible Doctrin? No such matter. You say. 7.  
 The Heathen must belieue that Christ dyed, rose again, wrought  
 many miracles, and sent his Apostles to preach his Doctrin. &c.  
 He answers, these being Articles of your faith registred in Scripture,  
 you, Sr, either vrge him to belieue them, as you ought to doe cer-  
 tainly and infallibly, and this you cannot exact, for you belieue  
 them because they are in Scripture, and yet you haue not proued  
 to the Heathen so much as probably, that Scripture is of Diuine  
 inspiration, Therefore you suppose what he denies, and pittifully  
 beg the Question.

Mr. Stilling:  
 proofs found  
 weighblejs.

Nothing yet  
 proued.



The question  
still begged

By what  
miracles  
Sectaries,  
plead,

11. Or. 2. You will haue him yeild an assent to them vpon the humane testimony of many Christians which you say is fallible and may be false, and that auail's nothing, for thus the Turks belieue the Alcoran the Chineses their bible vpon the Testimony of innumerable witnesses. You say. & None can question whether the Doctrin be Diuine, when the Person who declared it to the world was so Diuine and extraordinary a Person holym his conuersation, wrought vnparalled miracles, rose from death to life, conuersed with his Disciples, and gaue euidence of their fidelity by laying down their liues to attest the Truth &c. Contra. 1. Replies the Heathen. Here is again the same *Petitio principii*, for either you belieue these particulars because Scripture record's them, and then you suppose Scripture to be true and Diuine, which he denies, or because fallible men report them (you own no infallible tradition) and this aduances not your cause at all, for the Turks and those of China talk as much of their *Mahomet*, and *Confusius* vpon fallible, and perhaps false reports also (for yet the Heathen knowes not what Religion is true) And next wonders why you speak of miracles, of power ouer euil spirits, of men laying down their liues &c. when you Sectaries either deny, or slight all the miracles evidently done in the Catholick Church, as also the power She manifest's in casting out Diuels &c. And if we mention Martyrs, Catholicks haue more, who layd down their liues in defense of the Doctrin of this one Church, than suffered for Christ, whilst the Apostles preach't to the world. You hint some thing at miracles (like one half affraid to meddle with such Motiues) and say these wonders proue the truth of Apostolical Doctrin. Pray you Sr Answer? When you plead by miracles Doe you only allow those which Scripture relates, or others also known by History and humane Authority? If you rely on the first, you suppose what now is in Question. Viz. That Scripture is infallible and of Diuine inspiration, If you own miracles registred in Ecclesiastical history, and the liues of Saints, you haue, as I now said of Martyrs, a greater number wrought in the Roman Catholick Church in the ages after Christ, than were done whilst he and his Apostles liued. Slight such a Cloud of witnesses as

attest these later wonders, and speak no more (as you doe) of any certainty grounded vpon the report of honest men; Own them vpon humane authority as morally indubitable, and you proue by virtue of these Miracles, that the Doctrin of the Catholick Church, is still Apostolical and Orthodox.

12. Now here by the way I must lay open your fallacy, when you recurr to miracles recounted in Scripture only, and reiect others wrought by the Church. Thus I argue. Either you suppose and belieue the Doctrin of Scripture to be Diuine, because you find the Miracles of Christ and his Apostles recorded there, (and propose these as the first Motiue, and inducement of your belieuing Scripture) or independently of Scripture Miracles, you proue the Doctrin to be Diuine; yea, and the very miracles recounted there, to be indited by the Holy Ghost. If you belieue the Diuinity of Scripture induced therevnto by Miracles related in that Holy book, you aduance nothing, for all you say is, *that you proue Scripture, Diuine because it recounts these wonders, which are as obscure to à Heathen as the Diuinity, or the sacred Doctrin of Scripture is*, Therefore you make à most vicious Circle, for you proue the Diuinity of Scripture by *Miracles internal to the book*, and the Miracles themselues (not otherwise known) by the *Diuinity of Scripture*. Now if you say you know the Scriptures Diuinity antecedently, or before you recurr to Miracles related there, Scripture-Miracles are vseles to your purpose, for, if the supposition stand, They are yet no more but *objects of Faith*, and therefore cannot serue you as motiues and inducements to belieue that very Diuinity, which is now supposed known *aliunde*, and most sufficiently without them.

13. One may ask, if God had neuer done any other Miracles but such as Scripture relates, whether these are not sufficient to work belief in all? The Heathen answers negatively, and makes them insufficient, because Scripture is not proued Diuine by them. And all may answer so, if Scripture be not otherwise first proued Diuine, before we haue recourse to miracles internal to the book. Howener, admit gratis they were

*A dilemma,  
which forceth Sa-  
uarins to à  
vicious Cir-  
cle.*

*Miracles  
related in  
Scripture  
Conuince not  
à Heathen.*

sufficient, the most you can infer is, That, the Primitive Church which shewed them was Orthodox, but whether any other Church yet preserves the same pure Doctrine, may be well questioned by a Heathen. And here in passing, you may note a singular Providence of God, who age after age has illustrated his Church with most manifest and vndoubted miracles, whereof more largely hereafter. Disc. 2. C. 8.

14. You say lastly. That which God chiefly requires from a Heathen is the belief of the Truth and Diuinity of his Doctrine. He answers he is ready to do so, when you proue the Doctrine to be Diuinely inspired, and infallible. But hitherto you handle things so faintly, that though the matter you treat be excellent in itself, yet your proofs (most dissatisfactory) come not home to convince it. Your mishap is iust like that of an ill lawyer, who has a good cause in hand, but knows not how to handle it. Your whole Method is vnmethodical, your proofs prooflesse, your iumbling most intolerable. In a word, you giue no rational account of the reasonableness, of the Truth, of the Diuinity, or of the infallibility of Christs Doctrine. Therefore saith the Heathen, I'll suspend my iudgement till I meet with a more knowing Aduersary, who I hope will not proue *Truth by simply saying he speaks it*, but Convince it vpon vdeniable Principles.

*A Good  
Cause ill  
handled by  
Mr:  
Stillingfleet*

15. But our Heathen hath not yet done with Mr: Stillingfleet; for he saith plainly, Though all the proofs hitherto hinted at might pass, or were supposed valid, yet there is not one word spoken to the purpose, in behalf of Protestancy. If you wonder at the bold Assertion, ponder well his reason. You, Mr: Stillingfleet; haue treated all this while of the excellency and reasonableness of Christian Religion, considered no man knows how. Pray you lurk not in such General terms, but tell me particularly what Christian Religion is thus good, excellent, and reasonable. If good and excellent, it must be now found in the world. Is it Arianism? Pelagianism? Donatism? Quakerism? These sects profess Christianity Are they all excellent and reasonable? Affirm it openly if you dare? Perhaps you will say no. Is it Popery?

By no means. For may your word be taken, it mantains false and erroneous Doctrin, and that's neither excellent nor reasonable. Is it Protestancy? Yes surely. This is the excellent and reasonable Religion. And is it possible? Can you perswade your self without further proof than your own proofesse word, that the perfect draught or *Idea* of Christianity lies so fair in the new Nothing of a few iarring Protestants, which all other Christians in the world decry as false and improbable? Can you think that a foul-mouthed Fryar as euer liued, and a Nunn sacrilegiously coupled together, layd the first foundation of this excellent and reasonable Christian Religion? Speak out, and tell vs what you iudge, or hereafter leaue of to vent such improbable Paradoxes? I speak of a Religion now extant in the world or known. 4. hundred years agoe to preuent your wonted subterfuge of running vp to the Primitiue Church, a most vnreasonable plea when you cannot say probably what that Church taught, but only by the Tradition of the present, which you most causlessly and vnworthily reiect. But hereof wee haue said enough in the other Treatise. Perhaps you'll reply. You defend that Church which hold's Doctrin agreeable to Scripture, I marry, Sir, but where shall we find it out? Amongst you Protestants think yee? when you know not probably the sense of scripture in one only controuerted Text, much less so fully, as excludes a possibility of doubting; nor shall you euer know, whilst you own a sense Contrary to the Roman Catholick Church, as is already proued.

Our Adversary Cannot say, which a mong so many Religions is excellent and reasonable.

They own an vnknown Church,

## CHAP. X.

*The first and easiest way to find out true Religion is not by Scripture only, though all Christians had moral certainty of the right Canon, and sense also, which is to say, the meer owning Christs Doctrin, is insufficient to prone it, to all sort of People.*

1. **T**He Assertion may seem strange had we not an evident proof at hand, and 'tis thus. The Iewes, Turks, and Pagans (although all Christians now and euer agreed in some chief verities concerning Christian Religion, as that *Iesus is our Redeemer*) reiect the Doctrin as fals, and foolish 1. Cor. 1. u. 23. *We preach Christ Crucified, à scandal to the Iewes, and à foolery to the Gentils.* Whereby you may well learn, how enormously Mr. Stillingsfleet erred aboue when he told vs, that the meer excellency and reasonableness of Christian Religion carries with it its own proof. Our Assertion is contrary, and grounded vpon this Principle. The Mysteries of Christian Doctrin considered in themselves, transcend all humane Capacity, and as the Apostle saith scandalize weak reason, Therefore the Mysteries meely laid forth to à Iew or Gentile are no conuiction, because they are aboue the reason of the very best Belieuers. Now if you say, they ought first to be belieued by faith without any preuius inducement, This is the worst of fooleries, for none of the Primitiue Christians, so much as belieued Christ or admitted Apostolical Doctrin, without rendring first some satisfactory reason (distinct from their faith) why they reiected the ancient Sinagogue and assented to that then new preach't learning. Some previous

*The proof of  
our Assertion  
opposite to  
Mr.  
Stillingsfleet.*

preuius light therefore, distinct from these abstruse Mysteries, which God laies before the eye of humane reason induceth all, whether Iewes or Gentils, to the true belief of Christianity, and Consequently the meer supposed verity of the Doctrin only, dark in it self, is no absolute mark or first *self evident* Principle, whereby we are immediatly moued to belieue such high secrets. Pray you tell me, should any one goe amongst some vnciuilised People, who either haue heard nothing, or very little of Christ, and only relate the story of his sacred Birth in a poor stable, of his obscure life from the 12.<sup>th</sup> year of his age till he began to preach &c. Would such Barbarians, think yee, assent to these strange things either by the force of humane reason, or Diuine Faith, without further proof or motiue to make all good? No certainly. Yet all is true and very true, yea, and most reasonable, but the *verity alone* is insufficient to perswade any that 'tis true.

*The verity of  
Christ's  
Doctrin no  
selfe Euid.  
cc.*

2. From this short discourse, whereof more in the second part, these vnderstandable inferences follow. 1. That Sectaries assert they know not what, when they make the true Preaching of the Gospel and right vse of Sacraments to be marks of the true Church. For the true Church (be it where you will) hath euer its marks antecedently supposed to the true preaching of the word, which marks, first manifest that mystical body (at least in a general way as I shall presently declare) and thus known by a *natural euidence*, she proposeth the Mysteries we belieue. Here is the reason *a priori* of my Assertion. That which is the *first object of our Faith cannot be the first object of our knowledge*, the Mysteries of our belief layd forth by the preaching of Gods word, are the *first objects of Faith*, (for these we belieue, and as believed they are obscure) therefore they cannot be the *first objects of knowledge* (if we speak strictly of knowledge) or marks preuiously inducing reason to belieue. Whence it is, that reason hath its euidence or prudent inducements layd forth vpon other extrinsical Principles, before we belieue. Belief therefore, whether you take it for the object *assented to*, or the

*The Church  
is known by  
her marks,  
before we  
believe.*



act wee *assent* by (being as I said obscure) can be no mark to self or to the true Church we believe in; for a mark is ever more known than that object is whereof it is a mark, or which is pointed at.

An Obiection,

Briefly solved,

The iudgement of Credibility, not attained by examining the Mysteries of Faith.

3. Some perhaps will say. The Church is usually defined *An Assembly of those who profess the true Doctrine of Christ*, therefore true Doctrine most essential to the Church, must necessarily be known before we know the total essence of the Church. By true Doctrine or the preaching of the word is a mark whereby we first find out the Church, and consequently the Church marked with evident clear motives, is no inducement to believe true Doctrine. The Argument is an evident fallacy. First because the Illiterate and simple Christians believe in the Church and have faith sufficient for salvation, though they never arrive to an explicit belief of every particular Doctrine taught by it. 2. They either explicitly believe all these particular Doctrines by Faith, and this is impossible, because all of them were never proposed *explicitly*, or, know them *ex terminis* to be Divine Truths by humane reason, when they are proposed, and this is most untrue. For who can say that this truth. *Christ is God and consubstantial with his Father*, is a verity more known *ex terminis* by humane reason, than the contrary error of the Arians is? You see therefore the objection is forceless: For, as one who reads Aristotle or Plato knows what is said, or the substance of the Doctrine by the sense of their words, yet remains ignorant whether it be true or false, without further reasoning and inspection, so a Gentile that reads our Christian Doctrine in the bible may know much of its sense, or what is said, yet he must both *discourse* and *reason* well, before he come to this settled iudgement. *All I read* (not evidently true *ex terminis*) *is yet indubitably so*. Now this iudgement is not first got by examining the particular verities which Scripture or the Church teaches. No. There is a far easier way whereby reason, after a further discourse concludes: that either God hath cheated the world by the Miracles, the sanctity, The blood-shedding of

Ma

Martyrs, and all those conuersions wrought by the Church, or we must grant, That, what the Church teaches is true, And this general iudgement arising immediatly from a due Ponderation of the motiues of Faith ( which is Science ) disposeth an vnderstanding to belieue this great Truth. *God speaks his eternal verities by that Church ( be it yet where you will ) which Christ Iesus founded.* And in this sense we say, a general Notion or knowledge of the Church manifested by supernatural signes, is vsually necessary to the belief of euery particular Doctrin deliuered by it, and consequently particular Doctrins can be no first mark, or sign of this Oracle. Thus much is here briefly hinted at to solue the objection. Hereafter, the whole Analysis shall be most particularly discus'd in its due place.

4. A. 2. inference. True Religion is first found by its marks and cognisances, before the pure and incorrupt books of Scripture can be ownd as Diuine. We come therefore to a knowledge of these incorrupt books by the help of that Christian Society where true Religion is taught, and cannot *first know* where true Religion is by the books of scripture only. I say. *First know*. For without all doubt when incorrupt Scripture together with the sense is once admitted vpon the authority of Christs Church, we argue and forceably as the Fathers anciently did, against Sectaries by Scripture: But all such arguments *presuppose* the Books proued Diuine, and sacred. The reason of the inference is. These Books only contain a simple narration of our Christian verities, which both Iewes and Gentils slight, therefore though we cry neuer so loud Scripture is *Diuine*, and written by the Holy Ghost, we effect nothing with these Aliens from Christ, vnless we first conuince the truth by proofs distinct from Scripture it self. And as little is done, if Christians of a different belief dispute by Scripture, when neither the Canon, nor the sense is agreed on. For example. Marcion produceth his Bible, The Arian his, and his sense, A third a Scripture without S. Iames Epistle, or that to the Hebrewes, Our Sectaries Crowd in with their book, whilst others as learned reiect

*The true Church is known before we can know the books of scripture.*

*No disputing by Scripture only, without the Canon and sense be agreed on.*

their Canon, and much more that sense they force from it in a hundred passages. What is to be done in this Confusion? Must wee admit of Marcions Bible, or submit to our Sectaries Canon, and new sense also? No certainly, it Cannot be expected. Perhaps they will say. we are to dispute the question, and rigidly examine who hath the true Canon and sense of Scripture, They or wee, This ends the difference. Very good. But say on I beseech you! And first giue vs à sure Principle (à doubtful one in so weighty à matter help's little) which may bear vp the controuersy, and at last end it, for vnless this principle be agreed on, the result of our dispute will be nothing but à fruitles wrangling. O the Fathers and Antiquity well pondered cannot but decide the debate. I answer, may we iudge by the effect, the assertion is most vntrue: For haue not we and Sectaries now read and pondered the Fathers and Antiquity for one whole age, what can be alleged on both sides, as well for the Canon as the sense, hath been said, and after all, are we not still as much at variance as farr off from ending the controuersy, as when we began it? Say Now, but vpon à solid Principle, who is in fault? The Sectary thinks wee vnderstand not the Fathers, and we are sure, he abuseth them with farr fetched glosses. He saith their words are clear for his sence, and we profess, the Contrary. Hitherto we come to nothing like à Principle. The Controuersy therefore driuen on no further, but to the Sectaries bare, *Yes* and our, *No*, hangs yet in the ayre wholly vndecided. The reason is. Though the Fathers words be neuer so plain for our Catholick verities, yet after the Sectary hath laid his glosses vpon them, they are most vnworthily made by him as doubtful, and à matter of as great contest, as the very sense of Scripture is, which both of vs would haue cleared by the Fathers testimony. That is. There is as much adoe (may Sectaries glosses haue place) to vnderstand, what à Father teaches concerning the sense of Scripture, as to vnderstand Scripture it self, before we haue recourse to the Fathers. To recurre therefore to their interpretation in Controuerted matters whilst Sectaries as much darken that

*The ancient  
Fathers per-  
verted by  
Sectaries, and  
not Contra-  
uersies.*

by their glosses, as they obscure the Scripture we dispute about, is evidently a most unfit way to end any Controuersy, vnless that which is the very matter of Dispute between vs, can be supposed a meet and sufficient means to end it, which is impossible. Now if the sectary blames vs because we reiect that sense, he draws from either Scripture or the Fathers, and he also reiect ours, what haue we but wrangling? Both parties hitherto only word it, and stand chafing at one another, without Principles. God therefore hath prouided vs a surer and easier way to end debates about Religion, whereof more in the sequelle Chapters.

*The matter  
in Dispute,  
no meet  
Principle to  
end it.*

## CHAP. XI.

*The Protestant takes away the only means to know true Religion by. His proofs, whether He defend's Protestancy or impugn's Catholick Doctrin, are vnreducible to Principles, and neuer goe beyond the weaknes of his own vnproued Assertion. Meer glosses support all He saith, which is evidenced by a brief bandling one Controuersy, touching the B. Sacrament. Theodoret wrong'd by Sectaries, cleared. His Doctrin is most Catholick.*

**N**Ote first. If God as I said above, once established true Religion among Christians, He made it so discernable from all false sects, that it may be found out by prudent reason. *Omni literaturâ notum* saith Tertull. lib. 1. de Testimonio animæ. Its more known then any other learning. For to say on the one side, That an infinite wisdom hath planted true Religion in the

world, which shall not perish, and on the other, to assert it cannot be proued or found out, is first to cast à blemish on Providence, and next to free all from the obligation of embracing it, because none can be obliged to embrace that which cannot be known by reason, or rational arguments. Note. 2. The Doctrin of Christ which essentially constitutes true Religion, stand's most firm vpon indubitable Principles applicable to the Belieuers reason. If therefore à Want be found of such proofs, and doubts arise, whether Christ's Doctrin be taught or no; None can by doubtful or ambiguous Principles only, absolutely say. *This is Christs Doctrin*, and Consequently the proofs of true Religion answer to the *Weightiness of the matter*, that is, they are clear, conuincing, and exclude à possibility of reasonable doubting. Thus much supposed.

*Proofs of  
true Reli-  
gion, easy  
and Con-  
uincing.*

2. I say first. who euer endeauour's to shew by arguments what Tenents of Religion now held amongst Christians are pure and Orthodox (when the matter is of Controuersy,) and cannot bring his proofs to à Clearer Principle, then the particular assertion is which should be proued, argues improbably. The Protestant in all the discussed matters of Religion doth so, that is, he neuer goes beyond the strength of his own weak assertion, but eludes all by talk wholly as dark and weightles as the very Assertion is, which should be proued; therefore he Argues improbably.

*The scallaries  
proofs, as  
dark as his  
Doctrin.*

3. To proue the Minor proposition wherein the difficulty lies. Take à veiw of all our Protestant Tenents as they differ from Catholick Doctrin, or Constitute this new reformed Religion and ask, what Protestant dare appear and venture to proue, That Faith only iustifies: The like I say of his other negatiue Articles, *Of no real Presence*, of no *Inuocation of Saints* of no *Sacrifice of the Mass*. &c. I absolutely affirm, He cannot make one of these Articles good by any vndoubted Principle, or establish any of them by à proof which is clearer, than that dark article is, which should be proued. One reason is. These Doctrins opposite to the Latin and Greek Church also, are not evidently known as truths by the light of nature, or by any receiued Principle grounded on Reuelation. No ancient Church reputed Orthodox held them 7. hundred years

*One reason  
of our Asser-  
tion.*

agone,

agone, and Consequently no vniuersal tradition is for them. The only difficulty is, whether Holy Scripture or the Fathers generally patronize such Doctrins? And to fauour Sectaries all that's possible, we will here moue no doubt of the letter of their Bible, but withall assure them, it will be impossible to draw such new learning out of that Book, and the impossibility will be thus manifested. As long as these men cannot proue their new Doctrin to be transmitted to them from as good and assured authority as their book of Scripture is transmitted (but vpon less sure grounds, or less assured tradition) so long their doctrin is naught and stands vnprincipled. But this is so, as we shall see presently. And you may by the way note here the difference between the Catholick and Protestant. The first, proues euery particular Tenet of his Faith by as sure a Principle as he proues his Bible to be Diuine, (the Church assures him of both) but the Sectary euer fall's short in this and cannot giue you so strong a proof for his particular Doctrin, as he doth for the very letter of his book, which he supposes teaches that Doctrin.

*The difference between the proofs of Catholicks and Protestants.*

4. But let vs come to the point which chiefly vrgeth, and take one particular Controuerſy (we cannot insist on all) and ask the Protestant. How he proues that the real presence of Christs sacred body (as Catholicks assert) is not expressed in the literal sense of those words. *This is my body.* His negatiue assertion most evidently is not there in plain terms. We therefore vrge him to make it good by a proof that's clear or more conuincing than his own dark and yet vnproued Negatiue is. And is he not obliged think yee to produce a strong proof indeed, when he hath so many powerful Aduersaries to contrast with? 1. The clear words of Christ now alleged 2. A long Catalogue of most ancient Fathers usually cited by Authors opposit to him. 3. The Authority of the Greek and Latin Church, for both Churches maintain the real substantial presence to this day. 4. The express Doctrin of general Councils, which define our Doctrin positively, and condemn the figuratiue presence of Sectaries 5. Euidēt Miracles wrought in confirmation of the Mystery, related by authors of most

*The grounds of our Catholick Tenets.*



most indubitable credit. These are no slight grounds of our Doctrin. Let vs see by what strong received Principle the Sectary endeauour's to weaken them, or ( which is immediatly to my purpose) proues his new negatiue *Position*. Has he the express letter of Scripture for his Negatiue: *Christ is not substantially present in the Eucharist*? Not one word in the whole Bible is like it, much contrary. Doth the sense of Scripture after all places are compared together fauour him? No. What euer sense he drawes from thence seemingly to his purpose, will be *as obscure and remote from the nature of a proof or any known Principle*, as his own improbable position is, and therefore most vnfit to perswade it. Has he as vniuersal Tradition or the vniuersal consent of Fathers for his negatiue, (or for that sense he would force out of Scripture), as he and we haue for the letter of the Text now cited? Nothing at all. And to show you how iustly I propose this question, call to mind what Mr: Stilling: exact's of his Aduersary Part. 1. c. 7. P. 216. *If I should*, saith he, *once see you proue the infallibility of your Church, the Pope's supremacy, Inuocation of Saints &c. by as unquestionable and vniuersal tradition as that is whereby we receiue the Scriptures*, I would extoll you for the only person that euer did any thing considerable on your side. Thus he speakes after this precaution giuen. Think not to sob vs off, *With the Tradition of your Church in stead of the Catholick*, with the ambiguous Testimonies of two or three Fathers, instead of the vniuersal consent of the Church since the Apostles times. Your own words Mr: Stilling: shall here condemn you. The Question is whether your *Negatiue*, *Christ is not really present in the Eucharist*, as Catholiks affirm, be Orthodox Doctrin? We exact as rigid a proof from you, as you demand of vs; but sob vs not off with your own talk (Tradition you haue none) nor with the ambiguous Testimonies of two or three Fathers, but giue vs the vniuersal consent of the Church since the Apostles time, as clear for your negatiue, as you demand of vs for the articles now mentioned; Or if this be too much, giue vs but only the indubitable sentiment of any Church, reputed Orthodox, four or five hundred years past for this your sense and assertion, and I will applaud

The Sectary  
answers not  
to any.

What we  
iustly require  
of Sectaries.

applaud you as à most singular person. But this you shall doe, when you haue turned all faith out of the world; that is neuer. I say therefore you haue no more but the ambiguous Testimonies of two or three Fathers (nay you haue not so much) for this Negative Doctrin; which vpon that account proue nothing, *because they are as dark for your sense, as the Doctrin is, which you would proue by them.*

§. For example. You may allege some passages out of S. Austin, chiefly that contra Adimant. C. 12. *Our Lord doubted not to say, This is my body when he gaue à sign of his body.* The obvious sense whereof without torturing the Text, is thus. Our Lord gaue vnto his Disciples the Consecrated species and accidents of bread, which were à sign of his Body *there contained*, and doubted not to say, that what he gaue them *vnder those accidents*, was really his body. Let now any one probably infer, that his sacred body was not then present vnder the accidents of bread, because S. Austin saith those accidents were à sign of his body *not absent*, for à sign or figure implies not the absence of the thing signified by it. Well, but grant contrary to truth all you can wish, The words at most are ambiguous, and therefore no fit Principle to ground an article of faith, as is now noted. You may next allege that known Testimony in Theodoret's Dialogues, *The Mystical signes after the sanctification recede not from their nature, but remain in their first substance, figure and form; are seen and touched as before.* I answer, Theoderet plainly speaks of the Mystical signes which are seen and touched, not of the inward substance of bread and wine, which are no immediate object of our senses, those signes recede not from their nature, but remain in their form and figure as before; and t'is Catholick Doctrin whereof more presently. But grant the vtmost. The words are only dubious and therefore insufficient to assure vs of an article of Faith, when contrary to the receiued Doctrin of the present Church. I assert yet more. Though any Father should say, That the substance and nature of bread and wine cease not to bee, there is nothing yet concluded against vs, for by these words *substance or nature*, the outward

S. Austin's  
words fauour  
not Seditaries.

More of  
Theoderet  
afterward.

M

Mas-

*Massiness*, or *Corpulency* of bread and wine may be well vnderstood, which as Theoderet saies remain. The reason is. In ordinary Speech we often giue to qualities which flow from the essence or nature of a thing the very name of the thing it self. Thus we say an excessive heat is *fire*, a Massy heauiness is *lead*, or a stone, wheras heat and heauiness in common philosophy, are only natural qualities or properties distinct from each substance, respectively. Such locutions, were they found, are at most dubious, but we stand in no need of any far-fetch't glosses.

*Tertullians  
sense, most  
plain and  
easy.*

6. Lastly Tertullians speech lib. 4. contra Marcio: cap. 39. et Cap. 21. Lucæ contain's no difficulty. *Christ taking bread into his hands and distributing it to his Disciples made the same his body, saying this is my Body;* That is, a figure of my body. Obserue the words. *Made the same his body*, and all is clear? What did he make so? I answer. That bread which in the old Testament was a figure of his body (according to the words of the Prophet. *Mittam lignum in panem eius.* Let vs put wood into his bread, that is a Croſ into his body) he makes now in the new law most truely and really his body. Whoever read's Tertullian, will find this to bee the genuine sense of his whole Discourse in the place cited, where first he ieer's Marcion. *Faciebat ad vanitatem Marcionis vt panis Crucifigeretur.* Then saies, Marcion vnderstand's not, that bread in the old Testament was a figure of Christ's body, as the Prophet Ierimie speak's. *Conſiciamus lignum in panem eius, scilicet,* (They are Tertullian's own words) *Crucem in Corpus eius.* That is a Croſ into his body. See Pamelius his learned notes vpon this passage, chiefly n. 662. and. 667. and you will easily free Tertullian from all ambiguity in Speech. There are yet other Authorities much weaker produced by Sectaries, but these now quoted seem sufficient for my chief aime, whereof more presently. In the interim I expect from these men a clamorous reply.

*A reply of  
seſſaries,  
answered.*

7. They will certainly tell vs the sense and explication now giuen to these Fathers are no more but meer vnproued guesſes, or thoughts of our fancy. I might first answer. This sense immediately flowes from the plain words which we admit, according to the

the rigid grammatical signification of every particular sentence. But let vs waue this, and ask, whether the contrary sense of sectaries be any more but meerly their vnproued glosses, or thoughts of fancy? I say they are so, and consequently as dark, and wholly obscure, as that Negatiue Proposition is, which should be proued by them. They storm, and say the sense is clear for them, I sily deny it, and assert the contrary. They perhaps will vrge me to proue my sense; I vrge them to proue theirs, which cannot be done by the Fathers own words without a surer Principle; For, you see, the words occasion the quarrel, but that which is the cause of our dissentions can neuer end them, or bring vs to any acquiescency, without a further Principle. And thus we stand *Andabatarum more*, winking and fighting. The one saies. *Yes*, The other. *No*. without fruit or further progress, and are yet far from ending difficulties.

8. Now here is that which I would haue all to reflect on, for it is of mighty importance, viz. That controuerries between the Catholick and a sectary, cannot but be an endles work, if both endeavour to decide them by Principles, and vary as much about the sense of those Principles, (which are supposed to end the Dispute) as we do about the very matter in question. This is euer so, whilst the sectary reiects an infallible Church or her vniuersal Tradition. Obserue well: The matter now in question is, Whether Christ be really present in the blessed Sacrament? We allege his own Sacred words. The Sectary saies we mistake the sense, and consequently will not haue the difficulty decided that way. To know the Truth, both of vs examin all the other passages in Scripture relating to the Mystery, both read the originals, and the different versions, both compare Text and text together, nothing is yet ended; Still we stand at variance about the sense, which should decide matters between vs. Next we read the Holy Fathers (for our Sectaries like not Tradition) they produce their Testimonies; we interpret. We produce ours; They also interpret. Obserue well I say. Are we not as much at variance about the sense of these Fathers, which are supposed a Principle to end

*A reflection  
necessary for  
all that write  
to Contro-  
uersies.*

*How Dispu-  
tes are made  
endless.*

our debates, as about the very meaning of Gods word? And doth not the matter in question still remain vndecided? Most evidently yes. Therefore, vnless some other means be afforded whereby we may come more easily to the knowledge and belief of the reuealed truth in this Mystery, (may Sectaries glosses haue place) all are cast into à labyrinth of seeking, without hope of finding what God will haue vs to belieue. In à word the plain truth is thus.

9. Sectaries will haue vs to dispute of Religion, but on such Terms as shall be sure neuer to end one difficulty. That is, they will haue vs to reason about matters of highest consequence, and with it destroy the *best ground of all reasoning*. I say therefore. If Religion were to be proued by Scripture only. (add to Scripture the authorities of Fathers) when euery one makes that sense of Scripture orthodox, which he conceiues to be so; Religion ere this day had been long since destroyed. For the Arian would haue his sense passe for truth, The Pelagian his, The Monothelite his, The Protestant his. All these different senses admitted, destroy the very *Essentials* of Christian Religion. And for this reason I would fain learn of any knowing man, What that owned Principle is, whereby the Sectary proues the sense he giues of Scripture to be more certainly à reuealed Truth, than that glosse is which either Arian or Pelagian foreteth out of the very book which Protestants read? I assert boldly, they are all alike: Guessees and meer fancies guide them, and nothing els. The Arians sense is not clear, no more is the Protestants: The Arian has no vniuersal Tradition for his sense, no more hath the Protestant. The Arian has no vniuersal consent of Fathers, no more has the Protestant. The Arian has no Church euer reputed Orthodox which owned his sense, no more hath the Protestant. Now if the Protestant recurr to the Primitive Church, The Arian will go higher to the very Apostles preaching, and auouch that his sense was taught by those first Masters of the Gospel. I say it once more, they are all alike, there is no difference between them. The Arians glosse is as good as the Protestants, and the Protestants wholly as bad as the Arians:

10. Hence

*A just parallel  
between  
Arians and  
Protestants.*

10. Hence I say. 2. The Protestant cannot aduance any thing like a proof in behalf of his own new opinions, and he is as far from Principles, when he opposes Catholick Doctrin. You haue the reason giuen already. No proof, less sure than the true sense of Scripture, taught and deliuered by a Church confessedly orthodox. No proof, less firm than that Church's authority and her receiued Tradition, can indubitably ascertain any of Christ's Sacred Doctrin. But it is euident Protestants want such proofs, when they either plead for their own opinions, or impugn Catholick Doctrin. And to make good what I say, I appeal to their own writings and ask euery iudicious Reader, whether he euer yet heard Protestant whilst he asserts no *Transubstantiation*, (for example) *No sacrifice of the Mass no Inuocation of Saints*, say plainly and positiuely vpon a solid ground: *Such an ancient Church reputed Orthodox confessedly denied Transubstantiation, Inuocation of saints, the Sacrifice of the Altar &c?* Such a passage of Scripture sensed and interpreted by that Orthodox Church, or general consent of Fathers agreeing with known Scripture and Church Doctrin, decried these Catholick Tenets, as we Sectaries do now? Has euer Protestant say, gone thus plainly to work? No God knows. I'll highly extoll the man that shall offer at it. What then is their strain of writing. All a long a meer cheat. They either argue negatively. *We find not, forsooth, Such Doctrins in antiquity* (which is false) and, though true, 'tis to no purpose; Or, they cite you two or three ambiguous Testimonies of the Fathers, gloss, and sense them as they please, and then cry victory. Thus Mr: Stiltingfleet proceed's as you shall see presently. I say, No such matter. An ambiguous Testimony of a Father glossed or sensed by you, is wholly insufficient to ground faith vpon, or to assert absolutely: *This is Christ's Doctrin*, without an ancient Orthodox Church, which indubitably maintaine'd the Position and that sense you would draw from a Father. And mark well what I say, we shall afterwards end all controuersies by it. In the mean time who is there so far from reason, that can perswade himselfe, that I or any ought to reiect what my Church teaches, because a

*Protestants  
Condemned  
by their own  
writings.*

*In what  
manner  
Sectaries  
handle con-  
trouersies.*



Sectary offer's to draw some few Fathers to à new sense which no Orthodox Church euer heard of? When all know, or should know, that no priuate mans opinion, no doubtful Text, much lesse Sectaries glosses added to an ambiguous sentence, can assure me what Christ's Doctrin is, which, as I said, euer stand's firm vpon *undubitable Principles*, or à Belieuer ought not to own it as Doctrin truly reuealed.

What is  
chiefly intended  
in Citing  
the Fathers,

11. But before I press this point further, and shew vpon what certain Principle the Catholick relies, when the Scriptures sent (the like is of the Fathers) is debated, I must needs entertain you à little (because it much auail's to my present purpose) with a few known Authorities of Fathers which either conuince our Catholick Doctrin of Christs real Presence in the Eucharist, or (we may boldly say) no truth was euer established by those great lights of the Church. I say *only a few*: for it is not my intent to collect half of what is vially quoted by Catholick Authors, my chief ayme being thus much at present, to make this truth manifest. That as long as Sectaries iarr with vs about the sense of Fathers and deliuer opinatiuely their contrary Sentiments, so long they do no more, but without fruit beat the aire and dispatch no work. Recourse therefore must be had to à clearer Principle, whereof we shall afterward treat at large. Now as I promised one Authority is to be examined.

*Theoderets Testimony alleged above, Contains most  
Catholick Doctrin.*

12. Whilst I was in hand with this Chapter à Gentleman of our Nation pleased to tell me of à late little book, called to remembrance, *The Rule of Faith*, wherein one passage of Theoderet is much vrged and thought vnanswerable. After some Discourse I shewed him my notes in the other Treatise. Disc. 4. C. 7. n. wherevnto He replied modestly, Surely Theoderet saies more than who either must suppose the very inward substance of bread

changed at all, or his Conference with the Eutychian Heretick becomes forcelesse, and this the little book presseth most. Sr, said I. It seem's very strange, that your late book brings again to light such stale objections, long since answered by one (to say nothing of many others) of our own Nation, the learned Brerley. Please to read with me Theoderet's own words first, and Brerley afterward. We turned to Theoderet, Paris Print 1642. Tom. 4. Dialog: 2. called *Inconfusio Dialogus*, and began with the pag. 84. Next I produced Brerley of the Liturgie of the Mass Colain Print 1620. dedicated to our late Soueraign Charles the first, then Prince of wales. Tract. 2. Sect. 8. P. 208. and sect: 11. page chiefly. 252. Having perused both, the Gentleman wondered his little book passed ouer so slightly the main thing considerable in this Dialogue, and that no word of answer was returned to the obseruations of Mr. Brerley, adding, it would do well to make the truth a little better known, which is my intent at present.

13. First, it cannot be doubted, but that the Eutychian Heretick concealed vnder the name of *Eranistes*, held our Lords whole Sacred body after his Ascension changed into his Diuinity. Contrariwise, Theoderet called, *Orthodoxus*, oppugn's the Herefy, and saith, Christs body remain's as it was before, true humane nature most glorious, and not conuerted into the Diuinity. Again, all who haue read the Dialogue know well, that the context to our present purpose is as followes. After the Orthodox had professed his belief of the Holy Eucharist to be the true body and blood of Christ, *Eranistes* the Heretick begin's his plea. In good time he's thou mentioned these Diuine Mysteries, for from them I will shew thee, that our Lord's body is changed into an other nature. Answer therefore to my question? Ortho. I will answer. Eran: How call'st thou that which is offered before the inuocation of the Priest? Ortho: I may not speak plainly, for it is likely some are present, not yet admitted to the Mysteries. Eran: Answer darkly or anigmatically. Ortho: It is yet, when offered, that meat which is made vp of such seeds. Eran: And how do we call the other sign or Symbole? Ortho: That is

What tella-  
ries would  
force from  
this an-  
swer.

Two Contra-  
ry positions.

Where the  
Hereticks  
seek's ad-  
vantage.

What the  
Orthodox  
and the  
Heretick  
believed.

is also a common name, which signifies a kind of drink, or cup. Eran  
But after the Sanctification how dost thou call them? Ortho:  
The body and blood of Christ. Eran: And dost thou believe that thou  
receivest the body and blood of Christ. Ortho: Οὐτω πιστεύω δι  
believe, Here vpon Eranistes infer's. As therefore the Symbols  
of our Lords body and blood are one thing before the Priests inno-  
cation, and after his inuocation are changed, and made other thing,  
even so the Lords body is changed into the Diuine substance.

14. Stay a little, Gentle Reader, and speak your thoughts  
freely. Is it not euident from this part of the Dialogue (the  
rest you shall haue presently) that both the Heretick and the Or-  
thodox did here suppose the verity of Christs real presence in the  
sacrament, as a known Doctrin receiued in the Church? The  
Heretick supposed it; otherwise he had been more than sensible  
to haue proued his pretended Transubstantiation of Christs hu-  
mane nature into the Godhead, by vrging a parity taken from  
that other Doctrin of the Transubstantiation of bread, into  
Christs body. His inference had been without life most languish-  
ing, had he drawn the false Doctrin of his conceited change  
from an other as false. viz. From *no real change made* in the bread  
after consecration. For how lame an inference would this haue  
been? Bread in the Sacrament remain's, as it was before, substan-  
tially bread, only deputed to a holy vse; that is, not *really changed*  
at all, yet from thence I will conclude, that Christs humane  
nature is really changed into the substance of his Diuinity. he  
who should say. Because bread is not substantially changed into  
Christs body, I will infer that the humane nature is changed into  
the Godhead, which is pure nonsense. And as great  
Nonsense would it haue been, had he only supposed the extrinsecal  
sacramental change of Protestants or from thence drawn his inferen-  
ce, that Christs body was really changed into his Diuinity.  
For the most which can be inferred out of this sacramental change  
only, is that Christs humane nature admit's in like manner of  
some new extrinsecal denomination.

The Here-  
tick supposes  
a true  
Change in  
bread, accor-  
ding to the  
Catholick  
Principle.

15. Now that Theophrastus or the Orthodox supposes also the  
know

Known Doctrin of the Church in this Mystery is manifest vpon these grounds. 1. You see how he was prouoked by the Heretick to deny the real presence and change of bread into Christs body. after sanctification how do'st thou call them? Again. Do'st thou believe that thou takes the body and blood of Christ &c? Observe I beseech you. Might not Theoderet thus strongly pressed, haue quite ouerthrown his Aduersaries argument; had he believed as Protestants believe, that the inward substance of bread is not changed into Christs body? For vpon this supposition he should haue replied. Thou ask'st me what these things are after sanctification? I answer they are substantially bread and wine, though *signes* of Christs body and blood. I answer, I take not Orally the true body and blood of Christ, but bread and wine only made à Sacrament. If therefore they still remain bread, and wine as before, I acquit my self clearly, and render thy argument forcelesse, for thou can'st not infer, because I and the Church hold bread and wine, not substantially changed in the Sacrament, That Christs humane nature is really and substantially changed into the Divinity. But Theoderet, as you hear, return's no such answer, but positiuely asserts the contrary plainly enough. *They are the body and blood of Christ. I receive that body and blood. &c.* Though he warily forbear's to expresse the change too significantly, because perhaps of some present, not yet admitted to the Mysteries. Again. And here is my. 2. ground. Theoderet who was an Orthodox Father, penned this Dialogue, and therefore as the learned Brekeley obserues, neither could nor would haue propounded the hereticks Argument vpon the Churches then receiued Doctrin of Transubstantiation, (which we see manifestly done) had that Doctrin been then strange, vnknown, or reputed false. Much less could he haue wrote as he doth. *That the symbols after the Priest's innocation are changed and made other things* had our Sectaries Doctrin of no Transubstantiation been then taught by the Church and reputed true. 3. Theoderet's great circumspection was needlesse. I may not speak openly, for it is likely some are present &c. If he had believed no other presence of Christ in the Sacrament,

*Theoderet  
also supposes  
à real chan-  
ge.*

*Clear rea-  
sons prove  
that supposi-  
tion.*

N

crament,

crament, than that, which Protestants call *Sacramental*: He might well without scruple in that opinion, have declared their sense, and said openly. The Sacrament before consecration was a plain piece of bread; and so it is substantially bread afterwards. Thou speakest improperly *Erastus*, whilst thou supposest the Symbols changed and made other things. I tell thee, they are not changed intrinsically, but totally remain in their inward substance as they were, only signifying Christ body and blood as they are deputed to a holy use. Thus the Orthodox should have both answered, and excepted against his Aduersary, had Protestant Doctrine been in those dayes owned by Christians, but he goes on in a quite different strain, as is already declared. Hence I say, this part of the Dialogue is so inuincible a proof against Protestants in behalf of the real Presence that it cannot be answered, and therefore the Centurists with other Hereticks quoted by Brekeley. pag. 111. and pag. 248. having charged S. Chrysostome with the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, censure Theoderet vpon the same score as one that speaks dangerously in the matter. These men it seem, saw no great force in the later part of the Dialogue which our modern Protestants so much vrge, and followes thus.

16. When Erastus had asserted that the Symbols by the inuocation of the Priest are changed and made other things, and from that change inferred, that our Lords body after his Ascension, was conuerted into the Diuine substance. The Orthodox Answer's. *Thou art caught in the net, thou hast won. For, the Mystical symbols after Sanctification go not away from their nature. For, they remain in their former essence, and figure, and form, and may be seen and touched as before. But yet they are understood to be those things, which they are made, and believed and adored to be those things, which are believed.* Thus the Latin interpreter render's Theoderet's words (you shall haue presently an other Lesson) though truly to read them as you see here, after due reflection made vpon the precedent part of the Dialogue, is so fully enough to affirm euery one of this learned Father's meaning, that I wonder any iudicious Man can scruple at it. The genuin sense is. *Thou*

*The Centurist's  
Censure  
Theoderet.*

*Theoderet's  
Assertion.*

*Erastus*

*Erasmus* maintain's that the visible circumscribed body of our Saviour was after his Ascension swallowed as it were up, or totally changed into his Godhead. To illustrate this thy Doctrin, thouakest a proof from the Mystical signes or Symbols of the blessed Sacrament, and not only from the inward substance of bread, which thou acknowledgedst changed. I tell thee thou art caught in thy own net, the parity fail's there for the Mystical signes remain to sense as before in the same exterior form and substance, they are seen, felt &c. Darest thou *Erasmus* say, Christ's sacred body retain's yet the same exterior form it had on earth? Has it yet in Heaven the same dimensions, as these symbols haue after Consecration? Is it visible, or extended? Answer as thou pleasest. Here is an answerable Dilemma for thee. Either thou maintain'st that Christ's glorious body is now visible and extended as the Symbols of the Sacrament are, Or, contrariwise, *not sensible, not seen, not extended.* Grant the first: Thou deniest thy own Doctrin, and must assert that his whole glorious body is not conuerted into the Godhead. Grant the second, or say, it has not the same exterior form, the same visibility and extension. Thy instance, and proofs taken from the Symbols of the Sacrament, are *Esop's* made null, and forcelesse, for these signes keep the same form as before, they are perceptible to sense, extended &c. and thus thou art both caught and conuinc'd.

17. By what is now said you find *Theoderet's* discourse most solid against the Heretick, who would needs infer, grounding himselfe vpon the change made in the Sacrament, that Christ's whole humane nature was conuerted into the Diuinity. Thus much saith *Theoderet*, is evidently false, for these Symbols remain in their exterior form, vnaltered, but Christ's humane body with thee remain's not so; for all in it, the very exterior is changed into the Godhead: Therefore thy proof, taken from the symbols of the Sacrament, not changed at all, is void of strength, faint, and weightlesse. Now that *Theoderet* speak's only of the outward symbols of the Sacrament, is manifest. First by what is noted already, where he saith we are partakers of the true body and blood

*His whole  
sense decla-  
red.*

*A dilemma,*

*Theoderet  
only speak's  
of the  
Species or  
accidents  
remaining.*



of Christ. 2. By his answer, to the Heretick, where he openly professeth, that though these symbols are seen and handled as before, yet to the *understanding, and Faith*, they contain the things we truly believe. *That is Christ's real body and blood.* And thus much He proues in the following words where he asserts, *that they are to be adored no other wise than Christ's immortal body is now adored, sitting at the right hand of his Father*, for in both places, as you may read in the text, the same word of Diuine honour is referred to Christ in the Sacrament, and now glorious in heauen.

Theoderet's  
Text, du-  
bious,

18. You must here haue à word of the other Lektion already hinted at which clears all, and takes away the least shadow of difficulty. The most eminent and learned Cardinal Perron propounds it, and proues it also absolutely the best, by six strong Arguments Liu. 2. De L'Eucharistie Chap. 12. P. 539. First saith he. There is certainly in Theoderet's Greek Text à dubious form of speaking, perhaps vsed on set purpose because of some Auditors present, not yet initiated, or first instructed in these Mysteries. The Original words are thus. *μὴ γὰρ ἐν τῷ πρῶτῳ οὐσίᾳ καὶ τοῦ αἵματος καὶ τοῦ ὄρους, καὶ ὁρᾶται ἐς καὶ ἀπὸ ἐκ.* That is. The symbols remain in their former essence, and figure, and form and may be seen &c. But read them thus saith the Cardinal, by à Transposition. *μὴ γὰρ ἐν καὶ τοῦ αἵματος καὶ τοῦ ὄρους τῇ πρῶτῃ οὐσίᾳ &c.* That is For they remain, and in the form, and in the figure of the first substance, and all difficulty ceases. For by this construction Theoderet only sayes, the accidents or species of bread and wine remain, intimating nothing at all of any inward substance of bread remaining, nay, his whole context supposes the inward substances changed into Christ's body.

Now the  
Cardinal  
reads,

19. If this Construction be admitted, so that the Genitiue *οὐσίᾳ*, be as it is à Genitiue, and the other two follow in form of Latin ablatiues, you haue this Coninatural sense. *Manent in prima essentia & formâ & figurâ.* The Symbols remain in the form and figure of their first essence, which preiudices nothing the real Transmutation of bread into Christ's body, but much confirm's it. But such à

Cor-

Construction, add's the learned Cardinal, on Transposition of words is not only possible, but very frequent in the Greek Language; whereof he giues examples, and one out of Theoderet. *σῶμα τῷ δεξιέρῃ τῆς φύσεως*. That is. *The body of our Lord of the nature*. In lieu of saying. *σῶμα τῆς φύσεως τῷ δεξιέρῳ*. id, est. *The body of the nature of our Lord*.

20. The Cardinal maintain's the construction now giuen both as the more elegant, and most agreeable to Theoderet's whole context; for many sound reasons. Here is one taken from the Authors very next words. *But they are understood to be those things which they are made, and believed and adored*. How Adored? *As they are truly believed*: That is, as containing the true body and blood of Christ. For were this not really so, Christ could not be adored: For as none can adore one that meerly takes vpon him the Maiesty of a King, who is not, with an Adoration due to that Maiesty, so none can honour or adore Christ in the Eucharist with an honour due to Christ, when truly and really he is not present, but saith Theoderet Christ is to be really adored in the Eucharist, and Consequently he is really present there.

*The reason why he read's so.*

21. For the rest I remit the Reader to C. Perron who in the following Chapters dissolues, and most clearly, what ever can be objected against his Doctrine. To end this point, be pleased to reflect vpon this one particular. Had Theoderet said. The Symbols remain in their first essence, figure, and form, and included in that very speech, as our Aduersaries will haue the very substance of bread, He had spoken most improperly which ill becom's so learned an Author, for vpon this supposition he speak's as incongruously as if one should say. Peter this very hour *who is himselfe* both Soul and body, remain's in *him selfe*, that is, in *his Soul and body*. But if you read with the Cardinal Thus. *Car ils demeurent, & en la forme; & en la figure de la premiere substance*. They remain and in the form, and in the figure, of the first substance of bread (before Consecration really formed and figured by them) the Construction is good, the sense most clear, perfect, and without exception.

*One reflection more.*

*The Cardinals reading clear's all.*

22. Thus much I have noted to satisfy the Gentleman; and hope never to hear Theodoret objected hereafter against Transubstantiation. If I doe, I shall say an old observation of mine alwaies proves true, and 'tis, That the best Arguments of Sectaries, Printed and reprinted in their little books, are like old thread-bare garments quite out of fashion cast off and rejected, I mean, answered over and over by Catholick Aunswers, yet Brusht up, must appear as new. And this, less blamable, may pass (for they can do no better,) but methinks it is intolerable, that they bring again to light such worn-out stuff, as you see now done in this particular, and dare not inform the Reader, how often it hath been torn & pieces. Yet the worst of all remain's; Viz. That they build their faith vpon sand, one dubious Authority of a Father (if yet dubious) supports it; and seem's to these new spirits ground enough, to foment Schism, to maintain a rebellion against an ancient Church, which never believed as they doe.

## CHAP. XII

*A Digression concerning the Real Presence. The Fathers plainly assert it. Sectaries glosses frivolous.*

*The agreement of the Church and Fathers make a Doctrine indubitable. The Catholick's certain Principle. A word with Mr: Stillingfleet*

1. **B**Efore we produce these Testimonies and lay open Mr: Stillingfleet's Mistakes, turn I beseech you to his Account of Protestancy. Part. 3. c. 3. page. 567. Where he treat's of Transubstantiation and calls it an reasonable Doctrine because repugnant to sense and reason also. It seem's contrary to sense,

for sense tells vs, what we see and tast is bread after consecration ; and reason vpon that sensible suggestion, ought to conclude, it still remains substantially bread. Obserue I beseech you, how the Gentleman to maintain his proofs drawn from sense, is not only forced to reiect the plain sense of Christ's words according to the letter. (*This is my body which is given for you : This is the Chalice of the new Testament, which is, or, shall be shed for you*) But moreouer, how he is thrown into a desperate quarrel wherein he will neuer come off handsomly ; For, he is engaged to make not only the Professors of the Roman and Greek Church, who indubitably believe the Real presence, more than stupid (because opposit so that he call's sense and reason) but besides, He contrast's with a far greater moral body of Christians ; I may rightly stile it the *Representatiue* of all named Christians in the world, excepting a few Protestants. He shew you how. At this day there are in that famous Temple of Hierusalem dedicated to the Holy Crois ( called the Church of the Sepulchre ) *Catholicks, Grecians, Abyssins* ( those most ancient Christians ) *Syrians, Maronites, Georgians*, and others. All haue their Altars in one and the same Church, and all ( though different in some Doctrinal points, and Ceremonies ) unanimously belieue a true vnbloody Sacrifice, and with it the real presence of Christ, after Consecration. No moderne sectaries haue place here witnessse Prince Radziuill in his *Ierosoly. Peregrin.* Antwerpe Print 1614. Pag. 109. Nay, they are so meanly thought of, that when the Prince named Lutherans, Zwinglians &c. The party he conuersed with, demanded whether they were Christians. What Christians said he ? and haue no Priest, no Altar no sacrifice offered vp to god in this sacred place, where Christ wrought our redemption ? you may see more hereof in the following page of this Author. In the mean while shall any say that, a *Representatiue* of so many Christians are to be deemed fooles vpon this account that they contradict sense and reason ? It is so vast a Paradox, that though Mr : Stillings should write volumes on this subiect, he would neuer speak a probable word against such a cloud of witnesses. You may add here-

*Mr Stillings  
quarrel's  
with all  
Christians,  
except a few  
Protestants.*

*The Chinese  
see difficulty.*

*Most Con-  
serv's the  
Incarnation.*

*Mr Stilling-  
fleet argues  
improbably.*

herevnto if you please, those many Christians converted to our Catholick Faith in that vast Kingdome of *China* (a People, the whole world knowes most ingenious) All of them, as I have heard from two worthy men, a long time Millioners there (the one is yet living) who reclaimed many from their errors, raise most difficulties before their conversion against that one Mystery of our Faith, the *Incarnation of the Divine Word*, but after satisfaction receiued in this particular, they submit easily to the belief of other Catholick verities, and neuer Scruple in the least at the Mystery of the Eucharist, as a Doctrine *Contrary to sense and reason*. And they proceed most rationally, for in real truth, there are incomparably greater difficulties in this one Mystery of the Incarnation, to say nothing of the Trinity, (might weak reason decide the case) than in the other. What? That God who is essentially immutable becomes man by a yunion betwixt the Diuine word and humane nature, which yunion toucheth so intrinsically on that Diuine Person, that we must truly say, This word is now intrinsically affected otherwise then he was before; and so conceive all this done without a real change (may the Common notion of mutation stand. *Mutari est rem aliter se habere*) is a difficulty so great, (say good Diuins) that it hath rack't many a strong wit, and yet can scarce be well solued. *Utamque enim Substantiam in unam conuenisse personam*. &c. (They are words of S. Leo Sermo. 9, de Natiu. Dni) *nisi fides credat, sermo non explicat*. That is the Mystery is very abstruse. I verily belieue Mr Stilling: Metaphysick will not reach so high as to giue full satisfaction herein, though he is pleased to plead evidence drawn from sense and reason against the B. Sacrament, as if forsooth, the full portion of both, were like a legacy bequeathed him and a few Sectaries, whilst so many Fathers, so many Schoolmen, soo many profound Doctors of our renowned Church, must haue no small share allowed in either, but are as you see censured like men senseless, and vnreasonable

2. Say, I beseech you. Who can perswade himself that those three worthy eminent Cardinals, Bellarmine, Perron, and Richelieu (all haue writ on this subiect, and are famous the whole world over

for their great wisdom and learning) who dare, I say, without à measureless audacity, cast these (could we urge no more) into the Catalogue of dull, senseles, and vnreasonable men? None would haue ventured on such à vast improbability but one who either knowes not, or cares not what he saies. Now add to these the consent and acknowledgment of the whole Orthodox world, you may iustly say, it is much harder; or there is more violence offered to mans vnderstanding in conceiuing, that God who is essential Verity (and therefore inclined to preferue the Church he founded in truth) should permit all those millions of Christians who haue beliened the Real presence, to be so long deceived in their Faith; than to submit vpon so great authority, *to the very mystery we belien:* For by submitting to the mystery, we proceed rationally, and prudently iudge, that an infinite power can do more than our weak capacities reach vnto; but if we say, his Goodnes hath permitted the Church to be seduced by à gross errour age after age, or that so many Christians haue been cheated into à false belief of so high à Mystery; we force our vnderstandings more, we clash with an euident Principle, and must assert, that God has no care of his Church, or of mans saluation. The blame therefore if we be in errour, would at last redound to God, as I shall amply proue in the next Discourse.

*Reason more  
rack'd, by  
denying,  
then belie-  
ning the  
Mystery.*

3. Thus much noted, Let vs look à little into the strength of Mr Stillingf: weak argument, which must run thus. What I see seem's, or is bread to the Eye and tast, yet t'is not bread but Christs sacred body, therefore the Mystery is contrary to sense. One distinction ouerthrowes this lame discourse. I answer in à word. What I see seems, or is the *inward substance of bread*, I deny it. What I see seems, yea really is, the *outward accidents* or species of bread, I grant that. Therefore the Mystery is contrary to sense, I deny the consequence. The Argument purely fallacious suppo-

*Our Adver-  
saries  
fallacy,  
solued.*

seth the immediate object of our sense to be the inward substance of bread, which yet as euery Puny knowes is not so in common Philosophy, for the immediate object of the Eye is colour or light, and so much remains after consecration, as well as other accidents



accidents doe, but these sensible objects are in known Philosophy distinct from the inward substance of bread, which is not immediately visible, tangible, or tastable. Mr Stilling: therefore gain's little by this dreaming way of arguing. Now à word to his plea of Reason.

4. He may say. Reason tell's me there is bread still after consecration. Why so? surely the answer must be, because sense upon the discovery of its immediate objects, colour, quantity &c. induceth reason to conclude there is bread vnder these accidents. I answer. Reason thus far would well conclude, were it not that a stronger Principle enters here, which ouerawes (as it were) weak reason and bids it yeild. Pray you tell me. Did not sense and reason also, assure Christs Disciples Matth: 14. before S. Peter was seen walking on the water, that that liquid substance could not bear vp à weighty body without sinking? yes most assuredly: yet they saw him walk, and reason following the guidance of their eyes checked that other natural discourse, and acknowledged à Miracle. And thus weak reason must yeild in the present Mystery when à stronger Principle interuen's, and forceth it to submit. Thanks be to God. *Habemus firmiores prophetici sermonem.* 1. Petr. 2. we haue yet à stronger Principle to vp hold our cause than weak discourse is, The spirit of eternal truth. The express words of Christ which the wit of man shall neuer draw to any other sense, but what we Catholicks own. 2. The constant professed Doctrin of the two Churches, Greek and Latin, yea, and I say more, of all other called Christians, as is now declared. 3. Might we here introduce the known Testimonies of most ancient Fathers, They are so numerous, and so fully significant, that would à Catholick study to see down the truth of this Doctrin, he cannot do it in clearer language.

*Stronger Principles where upon our Faith relies.*

5. Good God saith S. Chrysostome. lib. 3. de Sacerd: Cap. 4. What à wonderful miracle is this? how great is Gods love towards mankind? Behold who fureth about with his Father, in one and the same moment of time is touched by the hands of vs all, and giueth himself in such as are desirous to receive and embrace him. Theophylact c. 4. in 26. Matth.

26. Matth. Bread is transubstantiated or transformed by an ineffable operation, although to vs it seem's bread. Because we are weak and have horror to eat raw flesh, especially the flesh of man, for this reason bread appears, but in the essence and substance it is not bread. Again, Christ said not, this is a figure, but this is my body, for by an ineffable operation, bread is changed &c. Indeed it appears Bread, but it is really flesh. Yet more. How often do the Fathers, S. Cyril of Hierusalem, S. Chrysostome and others exhort vs not to come unto the Eucharist as unto simple bread and wine, for say they, it is the body and blood of Christ according to our Lords affirmation. Although sense suggest the contrary, yet let faith confirm that. Judge not of the thing by thy taste &c. Again, know this and with full certitude believe, that the bread seen is not bread, though it seems so to the taste, but the body of Christ, and that wine seen is not wine, though taste induce it to be wine, but the blood of Christ. Though, saith S. Chrysostome, what we see, seem's to our sense and thinking to be bread, Let Gods saying (This is my body) Master our sense and reason. Let us do this in all things especially in the mysteries, not regarding alone the things, which lie before vs, but holding fast to his words, For by his words we cannot be deceived, our senses may be deceived, his words cannot be untrue, our sense is often times beguiled &c. Thus these Fathers known to every one (to omit innumerable others) speak and believe, thus the Church of Christ speaks and believes also, and both as you see, stand opposite to Mr. Stilling: weak plea drawn from Sense and Reason.

The ancient  
Fathers  
speak in our  
behalf.

6. I might yet cite S. Chrysostome. In. 1. Cor. 2. hom. 24. who saith. The kingly body in heaven, is set before vs on earth. We touch it, and do not only touch it, but eat it. This body, the barbarous Magi after a long journey adored with fear and trembling. Thou (add's the Saint) see'st him not now in the manger, but on the altar, not held in a womans arms, but by a Priest present &c. Therefore in his Oration of S. Perbilg: he explain's himself further. Truly, this table supplies the place of the manger, for here also is our Lords body laid. Paschasius a latin author, who lived about the year 800. is so express for the real Presence and Transubstantiation in his book *De Corp. & Sanguine Dni*, that the Centurist's Cent. 9. C. 4.

Other  
theorists,  
Chrysostom,  
Paschasius  
Damascenus

Col. 215. Prætorius de Sacramen: Pag: 288. and other Sectaries charge him with the Doctrin of Transubstantiation and oral eating of Christs body. No less plain and express is S. Iohn Damascen. lib. 4. Ortho. Fid.: whose discourses on this subject though long, is most significant. *As bread, saith he, naturally meat, and wine, and water by drink, are changed into the body and blood of him that eats and drink's. So this bread proposed, the wine and water also by the invocation and coming of the Holy Ghost, are in a miraculous manner converted into Christs body and blood, neither are they two, but one, and the same. Our Lord himself hath said. This is not a sign of my body, but my body. This is not a sign of my blood, but my blood.* Hence Prætorius now cited P. 288. reiects the Doctrin, and call's this miraculous Transubstantiation held by S. Iohn Damascen slight and fabulous, sodo other Sectaries with him also.

*The Testi-  
mony of S.  
Ignatius  
Martyr,  
clear.*

7. There are yet more ancient authorities most pressing to our purpose, were it not *Adum agere* to say again what has been so often noted. First the Testimony of S. Ignatius Martyr who liued with our Saviour and was Scholler to S. Iohn, seem's to me vnanswerable. Epist. ad Smirnen: not far from the beginning, *They, saith he (that is certain Sacramentarians) admit not Eucharists, and oblations, because they do not Confess the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Saviour Iesus Christ, which flesh suffered for our sins, and his Father graciously raised from the dead.* So Theoderet, 12. ages since. Tom. 4. Dialogo. 7. reads. And Isaac Vossius who followes the Florentine Copy, differ liete, or rather nothing at all. None can reasonably call the Epistle into doubt which Vossius places before the other. Epistles and the sense as you see is most clear.

*S. Iustine's  
also most  
significant.*

8. The second authority as pregnant, is taken out of S. Iustin Martyr in his Apology for Christians, vially called the 2. Apology, Paris print 1615. Towards the end at those words: *ὡς γὰρ ἀπὸ κοινῶν ἀγρῶν, ἠδὲ κοινῶν ποτῶν. &c.* For *We take not this Eucharist as common bread and common drink, but as Iesus Christ our Saviour by the Word of God was made flesh, and had for our salvation flesh and blood; so also after the same manner, we are taught, that the food which by the prayer of the Word is by him consecrated with*

*thank*

thanksgiving, of which food our flesh and blood are by transmutation nourished, is the flesh and blood of that Iesus Christ which was Incarnate. And for proof hereof, he allegeth Christs own words. *This is my body. This is my blood.* Thus S. Iustin speak's who liued not long after the Apostles about the year 150. and nothing can be more express in behalf of Catholick Doctrin. I know some Sectaries Cauil at the expression. *Κατὰ μεταβολήν.* by transmutation, and think Iustin held the Eucharist to be food for the body, but his sense is clear, for he saith only, That the same food which nourishes our bodies by real transmutation, is made after consecration the very body of Christ, and therefore Gaspar Laurentius a learned Calvinist in his *Orthodoxus Consensu*. Pag: 368. translates Iustins words out of the Greek thus. *Sumimus autem hunc panem & hunc potum non ut Communem, sed eo modo quo edocti sumus, Iesum Christum seruatorem nostrum, habuisse pro salute nostra, carnem & sanguinem: sic enim cibum illum ex quo nostra Caro & sanguis aluntur, post benedictionem ipsius, esse carnem & sanguinem Domini.* That is in plain English. The bread or food which naturally nourishes our bodies is by vertue of Consecration made the sacred body of our Incarnate Saviour. Conformable hereunto, Gelenius also quoted in the Annotations vpon S. Irenæus aduersus Hæreses lib. 4. C. 24. n. 26. renders S. Iustins words. *Sic per verbum precationis & gratiarum actionis, sacratam ab ipso alimoniam, qua mutata, nutrit nostram carnem & sanguinem, illum Incarnati Iesu carnem & sanguinem esse didicimus.* The Interpreter also I follow, significantly renders the same sense. *Alimoniam, vnde &c.* The food from whence, from which, or where with, we are nourished, this very aliment is by Consecration made the body of our Incarnate Iesus. Well, but admit that Iustine call's the Eucharist nourishment to our bodies, he makes it not therefore Corporal food, but Spiritual, which nourishes them to a ioyful resurrection or to immortality, and thus the other Fathers, chiefly S. Irenæus now cited c. 24. versus finem speaks. *Quomodo, saith he, rursus dicunt &c?* How do these Hereticks plead again, that our flesh shall come to corruption, and not take life from the body and blood of our Lord,

The sectaries  
Cauil, an-  
swered,

S. Iustin's  
true sense.

How some  
Fathers call  
the Eucha-  
rist Nourish-  
ment to the  
body.

where with it is nourished? Again: *Sic & corpora nostra &c.* and thus our bodies receiving the Eucharist, are not corruptible, having hope of a joyful resurrection. But enough of these authorities. Whosoever desires more may peruse Cardinal Perron in his. 2. book of the Holy Eucharist. Out of what is said already, I argue.

9. Either the now quoted Fathers and the Church also, have most impiously betrayed Christs cause in deliueing false Doctrine contrary to sense and reason, or worthily defended a Christian verity; Grant this second, we haue our intent. But if Sedaris say these Fathers cheated the world into a false belief; and impiously erred in their expressions: Ponder first, what a frontles impudence accompanies the reply. Next make this true inference. It is impossible, that such a supposed vniversal error should turn be raised out of the minds of men, by the force of any thing which has the likelihood of a received Principle. For, what proofs or vndoubted Principles can possibly outweigh the express words of Scripture, our Tradition, the sentiment of the Church, and the iudgement of the Fathers now alleged? Therefore if we be in error, the wit of man cannot vnbeguile vs vpon rational proofs and Principles. And here I vrge Mr Silling: to bring to light his contrary Principles as full and significant (that is, Scripture as clear, Fathers as clear, Tradition as clear, the Iudgement of some owned Orthodox Church as clear and vndoubted) for the opinion he hold's, as we now allege in the defense of our Catholick verity, Beliene it, if he suppose, as he certainly doth, the Church to haue erred so greatly for a thousand years, The Fathers to haue beguiled the world with their mistaken and most improper expressions on this subject, when they meant no such thing; He ought to fasten vpon some Principles indeed before we yield; and must not think to overthrow our Doctrine or soule vs, with a few gleanings pick't here and there out of antiquity, set forth with a hundred false and fancied glosses. Volumes may be filled with such slight stuff, which comes no neerer to Principles, than improbability to Euidence. Will you hear in passing one of his, improbabilities? If a man, such he. P. 567. may be bound to beliene that to be false which sense iudges

*A Conuincing Argument.*

*which Sedaris Cannot answer.*

*What Sedaris are obliged to.*

to be true (he means which weak reason vpon the discouery of lease iudges true, for our outward senses make no iudgement) *What assurance can be had of any Miracles brought to confirm the Christian Doctrin? Or what assurance had the Apostles of Christs resurrection, if their sight might be deceived about its proper object &c?* I am astonished to read this, and answer briefly. Christs Resurrection, (the like I say of Miracles) was most vndoubted vpon the discouery which sense and reason made in the presence of such objects, because no contrary Principle, so much as weakly, stood against that euidence, and therefore reason could no more doubt of what was objected to sense, then I now doubt of writing these lines. But all is contrary in the present Mytery. For here the vnanswerable words of Scripture, the Authority of my Church, the Clear Testimonies of Fathers, the voice and vote of Christianity force submissions on me to believe the Diuine Reuelation, which is either certainly known vpon these grounds, or we boldly say, no Christian verity was euer yet known vpon any sure Principle.

10. Perhaps Mr Stilling: may roundly grant, that the Greek and Latin Church erred in this Doctrin of the real presence for many ages, and consequently that innumerable learned Doctors haue not only been besotted them selues, but moreouer haue basely drawn millions of Christians into a damnable heresy of believing that to be Christs body, which really is not: Howeuer, he will honour the Fathers so far, as to afford them the fauour of his pphesies. Contra. 1. If the Church and all Christians erred so vast a time in professing this Doctrin, Mr Stilling: is obliged to name some Church reputed Orthodox. 3. or 4. hundred years past (for then there was a true Church in the world) which held his opinion, or as expressly denyed the real Presence, as our Church, both then, and now maintains it, and this will cost him more pains than to writ an other Account of Protestantcy, for I am sure there was neuer any such Church on earth. Contra. 2. If He interpret's the Fathers, He may as well interpret our Church Doctrin, and make all believe, that we Catholicks hold not yet the real presence. Obserue the same language in all. *That which in seem is not bread,*

*A word is our Adversaries strange demand.*

*What, if schismatics deny Church authority and explicate the Fathers?*

*The Church and Fathers speak alike of this Mytery.*



*Bread, though it seem's so to the tast, But the body of Christ.* Our sense may be deceived; Gods Word cannot deceive vs. The bread indeed made the flesh of Christ, and the wine his blood &c. Thus the Fathers deliuer their sense. and it is the Churches language also. If therefore Mr Stilling: can so gloss these words of the Fathers, as to make them speak Protestancy, or not to deliuer our Catholick Doctrin, I should not wonder, if in the next book set forth he aduentures to draw the very Definitions of the Council of Trent to his Protestant opinion of no real presence. If he did so, I am sure his attempt would proue as vn successful in the one case, as in the other.

11. Well. But permit him to interpret the Fathers, and to fall foule as he is wont to do, vpon our supposed Church errors, what is the vtmost that followes? Thus much only. Meer talk without Principles. For I ask vpon what Principle may I or any know, that his glosses (which striue to dead the very, obuius sense of the Fathers plain words) impleie not altogether as little satisfaction, as little assurance, as the very Doctrin doth which he would defend by it? If so (and so it is most evidently) as his Doctrin before his glosses was improbable to the rest of Christians, so his interpretations goe no higher, but are euery whit as improbable.

*So that his  
glosses vn-  
principled,  
worth No-  
thing.*

12. I must therefore tell Mr Stilling: that vnless his explanation of Scripture and Fathers rely on a certain Principle distinct from; and extrinsec to his glosses, they are worth nothing. For what auail's it me to read his glosses, when no receiued Principle uphold's them but fancy? Reflect a little. I read in Scripture *This is my body.* My Church tell's me the literal sense is true. The Fathers as you haue heard, and the Tradition of two Churches confirm this sense: Now comes Mr Stillingsfleet and first reuolts my Churches authority, then begins to strain the Fathers Testimonies with his glosses. Stay, Sr, say I. I except against your glosses, and iustly ask whether they are true or Counterfeit Copies. If true, they stand vpon Principles now briefly hinted at. Proceed this and I'll reuerence your glosses, but if you fail (and fail you must)

must) your Doctrin and glosses are both alike Counterfeit, and thoughts of fancy only.

13. Hee may reply. When Protestants cite, the Fathers against the Real presence, For example, That of *S. Austin*, or *Theodoret* mentioned above, we Catholicks explicate them, and now (which seem's foul play) we except against his Glosses, For, If we interpret, why may not Hee doe so also? A word only in passing conformable to what is noted above. If to decide this one Controversy of Christ's Real Presence, recourse be had to the Fathers, and the two aduerse Parties do no more but load such Testimonies as are alleged with their priuate interpretations, the Dispute will neuer be ended, Because priuate glosses leaue the two Dissenters as much at iarrs as they were before: God therefore, as I haue often said, affords an easier means to know his reuealed Truths. Now my Answer to the obiection is. The Catholick then only blames the Protestant's wilful interpretation, when it sham fully out-faces, the clear words of a Father, and when the Glosser has no vndubitable Principle distinct from his gloss wheron to settle his Doctrin, as he has not in our present Controuersy. Obserue well. The Fathers say, *What wee see is not bread, but Christs very body.* The Sectary interpret's. *That wee see is not common bread indeed, but Christs body Figuratively or sacramentally.* The Fathers say, it is not *figuratiuely* only, but really his body. So Theophilact and S. Iohn Damascen cited above. Had the Sectary who interpret's thus, an vndoubted Reuelation for his Gloss, deliuered by any Oracle of Truth, Scripture, Traditions or Orthodox Church, there would be good reason to giue him hearing, But when we euidently see, that the best and only proof of his Doctrin is no more, but the very gloss he makes, without Further Principles, we iustly except against him, and hold such glosses improvable.

14. Now all is contrary with the Catholick who neuer interpret's any Authority but when t'is dubious, and if it be so, it neither help's the Sectary, nor hurts the Catholick, and therefore ought In reason to be cast aside as either impertinent, or as weak and

P

force

*An Obiection.*

*Answered,  
and the  
reasoning.*

*Christ's  
Doctrin not  
proued by  
glosses, or  
any ambi-  
guous Testi-  
mony.*

forcelesse in all disputes of Controuerfies. The fundamentall Reason already hinted at, is. The true Doctrin of Christ, is not proued by Glosses or any doubtful Testimony, but stand's most firm vpon known and indubitable Principles ( or, if in order to Christians it want's such supports, it cannot pass for Christ's Doctrin ). An ambiguous Testimony therefore which seemingly opposes this true Doctrin *Certainly Principled*, is most impertinently alleged against any Tenet of our known and owned Catholick Faith.

*The Catho-  
lick Princi-  
ples;*

*Sectaries  
haue none  
such.*

15. Vpon this one sole ground now clearly laid forth, I confidently Affirm, all Controuerfies in Religion might be ended, would Sectaries please to lay Preiudice aside, and follow manifest reason. I'll shew you how. Write down first the two contrary Tenents of Catholicks and Protestants. *Christ is really and substantially present in the Eucharist. Christ is not really and substantially present.* Next examin well the Principles wheron these Contrary Doctrins rely or are supposed to rely. The Catholick vrgeth first, Christ's plain words. 2. The Authority of his Church and faith, his Churches Doctrin is the very same that Christ words literally taken, express. 3. He ponder's the clear Testimonies of Fathers, and discourses thus. When I find the most significant expressions of Fathers consonant to our Sauour's plain words, and to the owned Doctrin of my Church, I must assuredly rest on these, as indubitable grounds, or Confess, that There neither is or was euer any Principle for the soundest Article of Christian Faith. Examin next the Sectaries Principles. Has He any word in Scripture as clear as mine, or to this sence? *This is not my body, but a sign only of it*? Euidently No. Has he any Church esteemed Orthodox by the Christian world, which without Controuersy taught this Doctrin of *a sign only* three or 4. ages since? Name such a Church, He will speak's to the purpose. Has he Fathers so numerous, so express and clear, for his *signe and figure only*, as the few Testimonies now alleged are in behalf of Catholick Doctrin? If he haue let him please to produce them. I'll doe no more but lay my Testimonies by them, and if after the perusal, or a full

Parallel

Parallel made of both, All the world iudges not those I quote, to be most conuincing (may the literal sense stand) and his both dark and ambiguous, I will vndergoe any Censure. You haue heard how loud and express the Testimonies briefly hinted at, and innumerable more are for our Catholick Verity. I challenge Mr Stilling: to Confront them with others as openly significant for his opinion. I verily think he will neuer goe about to doe what is desired, but fob vs off with killing flies, and no man knowes what.

16. In the *interim* I Argue. I am either obliged to renounce the obuius sense of these Authorities which I see evidently Consonant to the words of Scripture, and to the Doctrin of my Church; or, by force of these Proofs am still to belieue as I doe. Grant this second, I stand on secure ground: But, if I am obliged to renounce the obuius sense of Christs words, my Church Doctrin, and the expressions of these Fathers &c. Our Aduersaries are bound, if a spark of Charity liues in their Hearts, to plead by stronger Principles which may settle me in an absolute Renuntiation of my Doctrin, and withdraw me from the supposed error I liue in. Is not this iustice and Charity think ye? And is not the Compliance most easy? For, if their Doctrin be Christs Doctrin, and mine not, Theirs stand's, as I now told you, vpon clear and indubitable Principles, And Principles of that nature are easily laid forth to euery ordinary vnderstanding. Now I subsume: But it is euident, the Sectary hath no such conuincing Principles, which can oblige me to renounce the plain literal sense of Christs words and the Fathers already cited. And this I proue. What euer Principle obliges me to renounce, or to deny the plain literal sense of such words, must giue assurance, that those expressions literally vnderstood are dangerous, and apt to induce Christians into gross error, for if literally taken, they do no mischief, or be not apt to induce into dangerous error, why should I Deny their obuius sense, because Protestants will haue me do so? But there is no Principle so much as meanly probable, whereby these expressions are proued false or inductiue into dangerous Error; for were this

*An Argu-  
ment drawn  
from our  
Catholick  
Principles.*

*Why none  
can remoue  
me from our  
Catholick  
Tenet.*

really so, some Church or Author of Credit, would long since have noted their ouer much vehemency, in saying more then was true concerning this Mystery, which none euer yet did. Therefore I may still and without Reproof hold where I am, and adhere to their literal Doctrin, which my Church teaches.

*Answer of  
Sectaries  
answered.*

17. Some may reply. Sectaries vrge vs not so crudely to reject the Fathers Testimonies, as only to moderate or rectify their sense by the help of our Modern mens glosses, which is à blames proceeding, for we do so with Gelafius and other Authors when they seemingly make against our Doctrin, and Protestants do no more. Answ. Protestants do more, for their interpretations euer imply à peremptory and absolute denial of that very literal sense which the Father words express. For example S. Cyril saith. Catech. Mystag. 4. *He that changed water into wine by his sole Will, hath also changed wine into blood.* The expression inuolues à parity, and implies thus much. That as water was really changed into wine at Cana in Galilee, so wine was really and substantially changed into Christs blood. Sectaries as peremptorily deny this real and substantial change of wine into blood, as if one should now deny the Real and substantial change of that water into wine. Consequently they renounce both the parity, and open sense of the words. And, (which is euer to be noted), wilfully do so, when they haue nothing like à sure Principle distinct from their gloss to ground their denial on. Contrariwise, the Catholick in this debate denies no express sense of any Fathers Testimony, but only makes Inquiry into the Signification of words, which are confessedly dubious. Take here one instance *Gelasius* saith. The substance or nature of bread and wine cease not to be. First I make no account of this *Gelasius*, Author of the book *De duobus naturis Christi*. *Contra Eutich*: He was not that holy Pope so called, but rather *Gelasius Cizicenus* as *Bellarmine* notes de *Scriptoribus Eccl*: Howeuer these two particles *substance* and *nature* may, *ex placito*, indifferently signify either the inward substance or outward Massinesse of bread and wine, for natural qualities which flow from an Essence, haue, or often sustain, as was noted aboue, the name of that Essence they

come

come from. Now the Catholick renounceth no obuious sense, but only contends that *Nature and substance* may signify, as is most vsual, the outward corpulent forms of bread and wine which cease not to be, And he giues this signification to these two words, because scripture Church and the Fathers, wheron his Doctrin irrefragably depends, forceth him to it, And he doth well when it cannot be proued by any probable Principle that Gelasius relates to the inward substance of bread and wine. Thus much may be said, if that authority were worth any thing. Read, I beseech, you Bre-reley, *In his Lyrurgy of the Masse* cited aboue pag: 259. you shall find there this Authority most exactly examined, and that in very truth, this Gelasius who euer he was, speaking against the Eutichians as Theoderet did, vndeniably defends our Catholick Doctrin of the Real presence and Transubstantiation also. Open the book and read, you will be satisfied. I cannot dwell longer on these long since defeated Obiections.

18. There is yet an other Reply. Sectaries may say, we suppose all this while Scripture and Fathers clear for our Catholick Doctrin. The Supposition is denied, because they quote (t'is true not many) but some Fathers and Scripture also, to countenance their new opinion. By the way here is occasion again, to reflect on what is often noted. viz. We quote Scripture and Fathers, and they explicate all; They cite also; and we do the like; and if nothing but à Return of explications thus pass from one to the other, we are as much iarring as we were before, without hope of ending Controuerfies this way. Now my Answer to the first part of the Obiection is. We Catholicks suppose nothing, but only take the very words of Scripture and Fathers in à literal sense, and say their expressions are exactly conformable to the Doctrin of the Roman Catholick Church, which was neuer censured by any Orthodox society of Christians. Vpon these Principles therefore, *Scripture, Church, and Fathers* we stand immouable. To that which followes I Answer. Sectaries haue not one syllable of Scripture in fauour of their Nouelty (and to omit à rehearsal of those triual Arguments drawn from certain passages, where they conceiue

*Of Gelasius.  
How much  
his authority  
is worth.*

*The answer  
to an other  
reply.*



*An Argu-  
ment which  
Sectaries  
Cannot  
solve.*

the Sacrament is called *bread* the *fruit* of the vine &c.) I conuincd my Assertion by the positive ground already established, which none shall overthrow. If this be the true sense of Scripture, when it speaks of the Blessed Sacrament. *Christ who is above in heaven is not really present on the Altar, but in his sign only*, Or, that the bread after Consecration is really what it was before natural bread, only deputed to a holy use; If this, I say, be the true sense of Gods word, Christs Orthodox Church expressly deliuered it to Christians as the true meaning of the Holy Ghost some few ages before Luther Reuolt, for then their was an Orthodox Church on earth: But no Orthodox Church then taught so, or sensed Scripture as Sectaries do now, Therefore vnless that Church was ignorant and knew not the meaning of Scripture, or Malicious, and concealed it from Christians, our Sectaries sense is not Scripture. To confirm this Reason. All know, that the Roman Catholick Church then, as well as now, absolutely renounced the sense which Sectaries force out of Scripture, and for that cause was not (say they) Orthodox in this particular Doctrin, but no other Church confessedly Orthodox, taught it at that time, Therefore, it was not thought the Scriptures true meaning. All I would say is briefly laid forth thus.

*How Secta-  
ries endea-  
uour to solve  
it.*

19. The true Church of Christs euer deliuers the true sense of Scripture at least in weighty and fundamental Matters, so much Protestants grant, But, No true Church deliuered this their sense three or four ages before Luthers reuolt, Ergo it was not the true meaning of the Holy Ghost, but a whimsy lately inuented. This Argument I hold demonstratiue. You will perhaps ask, What is that these men can pretend to, hauing neither Scripture nor Orthodox Church to rely on? Ile tell you in a word. They allege first two or three weak and ambiguous Sentences of Fathers, which the Catholick admitt's, not in the sense of Nouellists, yet according to the clear plain and obuious signification of words, it is now declared, and He prudently giues this signification to ambiguous words, because the Doctrin he owns stand's firm vpon other indubitable Principles, *Scripture, Church, and Fathers*. The

*Sectary*

Sectary evidently wants such Principles, and therefore vapors as well as he can with a few most weak and vnconcluding Authorities. The next thing relyed on, is much worse and purely nothing but fancy. He reads Scripture and those euident Testimonies of Fathers (as manifest for our Church Doctrin as it is clear that the Church teaches it) and these, forsooth, he endeauours to obscure by a number of his own improbable glosses, without the least shadow of any distinct Principle, which giues so much as a Colour to his fancied interpretations. You shall see this truth most manifestly proued in the ensuing Chapter.

### CHAP. XIII.

*Mr. Stillingfleet grossly abuseth the Fathers that assert the Real Presence. His vnprincipled glosses are not only dubious and therefore worth nothing, but moreouer highly improbable.*

**T**HOUGH I am very loath to spend time on trifles and as vnwilling to catch flies, as Mr. Stillingfleet is to kill them, (Tis his own phrase) yet I must do so in some measure, or permit a number of foule improbabilities to pass vnexamined, which are laid forth in a pretended *Rational account of Protestancy*. I shall only entertain you with a few of the Grosser sort, waiving many of lesser moment, and I doe thus much to defend a Christian Verity which my very Soul Adores, For I am well assured, If our belief of Christ's real Presence in the Eucharist be an errour, Christ and his Church and innumerable Fathers also, haue deceived vs.

2. One Authority alleged against Mr. Stillingfleet, you haue in his own page 568. And 'tis a known passage of S. Cyprian *de Cana Dmi*, or of some other Author not much inferiour to him, if we belieue Mr. Fulk against the Rhem's Testament. In 1. Cor. 11.  
and

120 Disc. 1. C. 13. *Mr. Stillingfleet abuses*

*S. Cyprian's  
Authority,  
examined.*

and Erasmus his Annotations vpon S. Cyprian, Basil print anno 1558. fol. 287. Mr Stilling: contend's it is of à later Date, yet is pleased by an Addition of his glosses to vnsense the words as well as he can, and at last make them to speak Protestancy.

3. The Authors words are These. *This common bread changed into flesh and blood giues life. The bread which our lord gave to his Disciples being Changed. Non effugit sed naturâ, not in outward form or semblance, but in its inward nature or substance, by the Omnipotency of the Word, is made flesh.*

*Mr Stilling-  
fleet's reas-  
oning not  
solid.*

4. Mr Stilling: Asserts all this proves not Transubstantiation, first, because the Author Saith Christs words. *Unless ye eate the flesh and drink the blood of the son of God, you shall haue no life in you,* are not to be vnderstood after à Carnal sense. Answ: That's true, yet your Inference, Sir, is most improbable. The Principle you must rely on, is. None are to think as the Capharnits did, witness S. Austin, that they were to cut into pieces Christs Sacred flesh, and eate that as we do Common meats, And your inferencie ill deduced run's thus. *Therefore the inward substance of bread is not changed into his body.* This inference, I say, is null, for both these are eternal truths and well consist together. *Bread is changed into Christs body, yet we neither cut that body à pieces or eate it, as the Capharnits grossly imagined.*

*His second  
Argument,  
more slight.*

5. He argues again and more improbably. This Author (saith he) by the effects attributed to the Sacrament, calling it food which nourished to immortality, cannot possibly be conceiued to speak if Christs Corporal presence, because we Catholics confesse Christs body remain's no longer in our body, then the Accidents of bread and wine are there. I verily think the man was busied with other thoughts when he wrot these lines. For what sense haue we here? Christs Sacred body really present giues grace and is no longer present then the Accidents of bread and wine remain, Ergo, bread and wine are not Really changed into his body. This I say is à most improbable inference. For the effects of the Sacrament which imply the production of Grace, may and must stand with Christs real Presence, though that production of grace  
Sacre-

Sacramentally giuen, last's no longer then his Blessed body is vnder the forms of bread and wine.

6. But an other doughty Argument is drawn out of S. Cyprian's words, which Mr. Stilling: cites in his Margent. *Sed immortalitatis alimonia datur à Communibus cibis differens, corporalis substantia retinens speciem, sed virtutis diuina inuisibili efficienciâ probans adesse presentiam.* And He vnworthily renders them thus in English. That immortal Nourishment is giuen vs which differs from common food, that it retain's the Nature of à Corporeal substance, but prouing the presence of à Diuine power by its inuisible efficiency. So that, saith he, what presence of Diuine power is there, is shewed in regard of the effects of it, not in regard of any substantial change of the bread into the body of Christ. Sr, I vtterly deny your proofesse, So That, and say your deduction is more then improbable. This Author saith expressely common bread changed into flesh, by the omnipotency of the word giueth life and immortal nourishment, which is Diuine grace, and therefore the Diuine power appears in both, first in the substantial change of bread into Christs body, next in the effect, or production of grace in à worthy Receiuer, and you improbably conclude, it shewes it self in regard of the effects only.

His third  
Argument  
proues  
nothing.

7. Like one half guilty of iugling you goe on. I know you will quarrel with me for rendering *Corporalis substantia retinens speciem*: By retaining the Nature of à Corporeal substance. Answ: I do so indeed, and will proue you à cheat for your pains. First, because you make this Author speak nonsense, for if *Corporalis substantia retinens Speciem*, may be Englished. By retaining the nature of à Corporeal substance, you may as well render it by retaining the substance, of à corporeal substance because nature and substance are here synonimous, And if this be sense, we haue à pretty Tautology or rather non-sense with it thus. It differ's from Common food, yet retains the substance of Corporeal substance, or common food, and in real truth is still natural bread or Common food. Whereas if we read. It differ's from common food, yet retain's the outward forms or external Accidents of à Corporeal substance or common food the sense is good,

The fallacy  
discovered.

Q

clear,

What the  
word *Species*  
signifies.

The true  
signification  
in this place,  
is this.

clear, and open to euery Reader. But we must go on. You contend that the word *Species* in this place Signifies *Nature* or a solid body, and not the external Accidents-because *Species ammonaria, Species largitionales, Curator Specierum*, whereof we read in the Ciuil law express the substance of things not the Accidents; and so S. Ambrose must be vnderstood, when speaking of our Saviour changing water into wine, he saith. *Vt rogatus ad nuptias aqua substantiam in vini speciem commutaret.* Now no man will say, that he changed the substance of water into the external Accidents of wine, but into the nature of wine, Therefore *Species* may sometimes signify substance. Answ: All this is true, yet nothing to the purpose for can you or any man proue, because *species* signifies sometimes kind, or substance that it alwaies doth so? We read in Scripture. Daniel 13. *Species decepta te.* Isa. 53. *non est ei Species neq. decor.* Daniel 10. *Species mea immutata* 1. Tim. 3. *Habeque Speciem pietatis &c.* Will you translate *Nature* or substance hath deceived thee? There was no nature or substance in Christ of whom the Prophet speaks. My nature or substance is changed. *Hanno pietas in nature or substance?* All is ridiculous, and therefore though *Species* may sometimes signify substance or kind, vnless that signification hold vniuersally, these instances of *Species ammonaria* and *Species vini* proue nothing. You will ask perhaps, because the word is ambiguous, how we may know whether in our present Controuersy, *species*, signifies shape, form, Accidents, or substance? Answ: This rule is certain, when the word *species* stand's in opposition, or is distinguished from an inuisible *Nature* or *essence*, it must of necessity signify the external shape or form of a thing and not the substance: So when the Apostle exhorts vs. 1. Thess. 2. 22. *Ab omni specie mala abstinete vos.* The sense is. Abstain not only from inward malice. but (and here mark the opposition) from all *Shew* or semblance of euil. And when S. Cyril saith Orat 4. *Mystag*: vnder the Type or *species* of bread is giuen the body of our Lord, he evidently distinguisheth the *Form* or shape of bread from its substance. And so S. Cyprian doth in the words alleged. *Corporali Substantia retinens Speciem*, retaining the external

not

their shape or form of a Corporeal substance, and more plainly thus. The bread being changed not in its outward Form and semblance, but in it's inward nature and substance by the Omnipotency of the Word, is made flesh.

8. Mr Stilling: again page 570. in his Answer to S. Cyprian. This common bread is changed into flesh and blood. saith, we Protestants do not deny a Sacramental change of the bread into the flesh and blood of Christ, but only that substantial change which ye Papists assert. Pray you, Sr, tell me what is the *Terminus à quo*, and the *Terminus, ad quem*, of this your mysterious change? You acknowledg some thing changed into the flesh and blood of Christ? Is the substance of bread the *terminus à quo*, or that which is changed into the flesh? No, 'tis too plain Popery. Is bread made a Sacrament, or a Sign of Christ's body changed into the flesh of Christs? Evidently no, for neither the Sacrament, nor that which you call a Sign of Christ's body is changed into flesh. Note well the Emphasis of your own words, of something changed into the flesh of Christ and say on Gods name what it is? You may reply, you speak only of a Mystical and Sacramental change. That's not to the purpose now, the Emphasis of your words point at something created or increated, changed into the flesh and blood of Christ, tell vs plainly what that is, or in good earnest your expression fal's too short of any intelligible sense?

9. In case you run on trifling with your Mystical and Sacramental change only, made vpon the accidents or substance of bread, the Author now cited positively asserts more. viz. *Panis non effigies sed naturâ mutatur*. The bread which our Lord gaue to his Disciples being changed, not in outward form, and appearance, but in its inward nature and substance by the Omnipotency of the word is made flesh, where 'tis plain your extrinsecal sacramental change passing only vpon the accidents of bread, or on the substance (which you say remains) is excluded, and a Real Conuerſion of the inward substance of bread is positively asserted by S. Cyprian. You Answer. Some great Criticks haue assured you that the place is corrupted, and that the ancient Manuscripts read otherwise. *Non effigies nec naturâ mutatur*, neither changed

Protestants cannot say, what is changed into Christ's body.

S Cyprian rejects the Protestants extrinsecal Change.



in outward form nor substance. You see to what desperate shifts these men are driven. Tis wonderful they cite not some great Criticks for a Contrary lection of Christs words. *Hoc non est corpus meum* This is not my body. Well. I say first, if those nameless and unknown Criticks err, and the Author speak sense as we now read without the Criticism. (*Non effigie sed naturâ mutatum*, not changed in outward form but in its nature) Transubstantiation is asserted, and your contrary Doctrin is condemned. I say. 2. This Criticism is improbable, and not only turn's the words out of sense into pure Nonsense, but moreover implies an impossibility. I'll shew you how. The Criticism will have vs read thus: *Panem istum quem Dominus Discipuli porrigebat, non effigie nec naturâ mutatum Omnipotentia verbi factus est Caro.* This bread which our Lord gave to his Disciples being changed neither in its outward form nor inward substance, is by the Omnipotency of the word made flesh. Observe well. This bread remaining bread in outward shew and inward substance, is made the flesh of the Son of God. An utter impossibility. For no more can bread remaining bread in shape and substance, be made flesh (*factum est caro*) than Lots wife remaining what She was flesh and blood in outward form, and inward substance, be made à pillar of salt. The Omnipotent power of God cannot change one substance remaining what it is, into another. Tis true Luther said Christs body was really present with bread, but never thought of making bread remaining bread, to be that other substance of Christs body.

A Criticism  
exploded.

10. Mr Stillingfleet tell's vs more. P. 572. that *Substance* and *nature* with the Fathers (and we confess it) are not alwayes taken properly but sometimes more largely for Accidents. Why therefore may not these words. *Sed natura mutatum* in S. Cyprians Context bear that improper sense? I Answer and ask first. Why may they not also be taken properly? When they clearly deliver à Doctrin conformable to à whole learned Church, and your contrary forced gloss hath no Principle to stand on but fancy? Had you any ancient Orthodox Church, vniuersal Tradition, or the plain consent of Fathers for what you assert, you might

might speak more boldly, and I would then say S. Cyprian's words are false, but without such helps, to torture a Text as you do, to turn good sense into nonsense and this without proof or Principle is more then intolerable. Now here reflect a little on what hath been often noted. You say, the words are improper and render your sense. I say they are proper and significantly speak what the Church teaches. Pray Answer. By what Principle shall you and I come to a decision of this one difficulty? Hitherto, if nothing be added, we have no more but our two contrary, iarring opinions. And are not Controuersies, (may this strain hold) made an endles work? To add more I Answer. 2. If this Author speak sense. *Not changed in its outward form but in nature.* Your gloss is Nonsense. Obserue well. He speaks of bread held in a Priests hand, and saith first. This bread is not changed in its outward form or Accidents. Then he put's his *Adversarium*. Sed, but it is changed in nature and substance If therefore Nature here, signifies as you would haue it, the outward form or accidents of bread, you must read the words thus. Bread is not changed in its nature and Substance yet it is changed in nature and substance, which is non-sense. I proue it. Nature and substance with you import the exterior form or Accidents of bread, bread is not changed in this exterior nature and substance, saith the Author, yet you say it is changed in this very nature and substance. Yet more. S. Cyprian asserts a change in one thing, not in an other. I ask what is changed, and what is not changed? If the exterior Accidents of bread, as contradistinguished from the interior substance be changed, this interior substance of bread, as distinguished from accidents, is not changed, and if, (which is true), this interior substance be changed, the form and accidents of bread are not changed. Take which you please, and talk no more of your Accidental Sacramental change/made after consecration, For I ask again what is this Sacramentally changed? Are the outward Accidents only changed or made a Sacrament? Grant this, and it follows you have but a very lean Lords supper. consisting only of a few Accidents after your wordy Consecration, which reaches not to the

Thereasom  
why we  
rethink it.

Sacrament  
cannot sup  
what is here  
changed  
was not,

inward *substance* of bread, Consequently this inward substance is not so much as *Sacramentally* changed. For the Author saith, one thing is here changed, and not an other. Imagin therefore, He speak's of your extrinſick Sacramental change, you will neuer force ſenſe out of his words, whilst he laies à change on *one thing* and excludes it from an other. For, if he saies the inward substance of bread is Sacramentally changed, he denies that to the outward accidents, and if he say these Accidents are Sacramentally changed, he denies that Sacramental change to the inward substance of bread. Let then *nature* and *Substance* signify either the accidents or substance of bread as you please, let vs also falsly suppose, the Author speaks of your Sacramental change only, you can neuer make ſenſe of his words. *One thing is changed, but not an other.* By all now said you see, Sir, how flight your obiection is, when you Argue. *Either nature and substance in the Fathers,* are alwaies taken properly, or some times not so, but improperly for accidents; if alwaies properly, we haue three Fathers (say you) against Transubstantiation. If sometimes improperly, *Nature* in this place though we read, *Non effigie sed natura mutatus*, may well signify not substance, but the outward form or accidents of bread. I haue now Answered, though *Nature* or *Substance* may sometimes haue that signification yet here it cannot, because of the euident opposition betwixt *that*, and *Accidents*, and the ineuitable nonsense which followes if *nature* in this place signifies *Accidents*. But what à loss of time is it to follow these vast improbabilities? I must make shorter work with the ensuing Authorities.

11. The. 2. Testimony cited P. 572. is that of S. Gregory Nyss Tom: 3. Orati. Catech C. 37. and stand's thus in Mr Stilling: *With good reason do we believe that the bread being sanctified by Gods Word is changed into the body of the Word of God.* Again. *The nature of the things we see being changed, Or Transclemented into him &c.* And Mr Stilling: Assert's those expressions are vtterly insignificant for Transubstantiation, for saith he. We Protestants deny not à change in the elements after Consecration, but say it is Sacramental, and you (Papists) say it is a Substantial

*A briefe Answer to a weak obiection.*

*S. Gregory Nyssens abused.*

tial change. *Ans.* And we follow the Energy of the plain grammatical sense. *Bread is changed into the body of the Word of God. Bread is Transubstantiated,* You insist only on an extrinsecal and Sacramental change, which you admit in the water of Baptism cast upon an Infant, yet you dare not say that water is *Transubstantiated*, or changed into another *Substance*. This to your Confusion *S. Gregory* asserts in our present Mystery, and you say it still remains to be proved that the substance of bread is changed. What trifles are these? I prove it by the very words, thus. Bread is a substance, the Saint tells you into what it is changed, *into the very body of the Word of God, Ergo* he saith *one substance is changed into another*. Here is the proof. You yet goe on. The word μεταποιῶντας, is frequently used by the Fathers and *S. Gregory* himself for an Accidental change, when T is not capable of any other sense. So *S. Gregory* speaking of the shining of Moses face, saith it was μεταποίησιν à Change into that which was more glorious : Again, affirming, the foules of men μεταποιήσονται, to be changed into that which is more Diuine by the Doctrine of Christ, he can surely intend no other but an Accidental change. *Answer.* Had I no more against Mr Stillings : but the manifest trifling I here see in a serious matter, that alone might most iustly displease. Pray, Sir, reflect. Doth *S. Gregory* by these Instances of Moses face changed into Glory, or by the Souls of men changed into that which is Diuine, so much as seemingly fauour the meer extrinsecal change which you ascribe to the Sacrament? Evidently No. For these changes were *Real* and *intrinsecal* in their respectiue Subjects, Glory was really in Moses face, as light is now in the sun. This fained Sacramental change in the Sacrament is only Moral, and extrinsecal, Therefore such instances are to no purpose. For can you make this probable inference? Moses face was intrinsecally changed as the ayr is when it receiues light, *ergo* we haue the like intrinsecal Physical change in the Sacrament, when by your Consecration bread is made an outward Sign only of Christ's body. Doth that bread really shine like the face of Moses? Or will any say when à *Counnet* is set for à *Crown*, as bread with you stands

*Instances  
impertinent-  
ly applied.*

*And proved  
impertinent.*

stand's for Christ's body, that it is intrinsically changed as Moses face was?

12. In a word the whole cheat is plain. You lay hold of the word *Accidental* which is ambiguous, and may either signify a Real intrinsical change made in Subjects as is now declared, (and this with you has no place in the Sacrament) or meerly an extrinsical accidental Denomination, whereby bread is made a Sign or Sacrament. And this you own, which God knowes, has no similitude with the Real changes where of S. Gregory speaks. Could you make a right Parity you should say; That, as Moses face was really changed by a glorious light, and a Soule by Regeneration, so bread after consecration (made intrinsically more glorious) is really changed either in its accidents, or substance, or both; But this you cannot pretend to. O, but it is made a Sacrament and now is what it was not before. And you Sr, are made a Bachelour of Divinity and are not as you were before, is your face, your substance, or Accidents so really changed in you, that they appear intrinsically more glorious to men and Angels? Well, but perhaps the word μεταποίησις may be accommodated to a meer extrinsical Accidental change, as when one of a common Citizen is made a Magistrate. Answ. Whether so or no it imports little, for in the instances now alleged, and in this Testimony of S. Gregory, such a signification has no place, where the *Terminus à quo*, and *ad quem* (*Bread is changed into Christ's body*) are Real, not only Moral; intrinsic, not extrinsical. Yet one word more. I wonder extremely with what face you can cite *Suares*, as if he fauored your late invented *Accidental* mutation, for you say he affirms, these expressions of Fathers are more accommodated to that. Sr. I have read this learned Author in the place you quote. 3. part: Disp. 50. sect 3. and perused also his 4. th Section, where he treat's largely of the Conuersion of bread into Christ's body, and expressly maintain's a Real action necessary in this Conuersion, and calls the change *Real* and *Substantial*, and it must be called so, when the *Terminus à quo*, and *ad quem* are, as they are in this Mystery, *Real* and *Substantial*: 'Tis true he cites Divines

A reply  
answered.

*Suares* abused.

who

who say, the Addition of Christs body vnder the formes of bread is sufficient to verify à Real change (Bread ceasing to be, because of Christs body present) without à new action or production terminated vpon that body, and it is à probable opinion in Schools, but as remote from your Accidental extrinsecal mutation as Heauen is from earth, and to as Little purpose as an other wise question is, when you Ask whether those who are changed by Regeneration may be said to be Transubstantiated by it? Friuolous. Sr. when the Term *ad quem* in conuerfions is substance, it beares properly the denomination of Transubstantiation, or Transclementation; when its merely an Accident or quality, as in Regeneration, the denomination followes the nature of the quality produced, and is rightly called an intrinsecal accidental change, but not Transubstantiation. Had you reflected on what is here said your pretty Criticism where you torture à poor Greek word and learnedly examin whether *μεταμορφωσις* in S. Gregory comes from the Noun *μορφωσις* or from the verbe *μορφω* might well haue been spared. I giue you your Choise take whether you will, your cause lies where it was, nothing arall aduanced. But really I am weary of this sport, which is more irksome to me, then to kill the flies you so often talk of. Howeuer I must haue patience, and briefly say à word to one or two authorities more, pitifully abused by you.

13. That known passage of S. Cyril of Hierusalem. *Catech. Mystag.* 4. occurs next in your 573. page. The words are. He (Christ our Lord) changed water into wine at cana in Galilee by his sole Will, and is he not worthy to be believed that he changed wine into blood? For if invited to à marriage, he wrought then that stupendous Miracle (viz of changing water into wine) shall we not Confess that much more he has given his body and blood to the Sons of the Spouse? wherefore *μὴτα πρὸς ἀληθοφῶνας* let vs take with all certainty the body and blood of Christ And he giues this reason. *ὅτι τὸ πρὸς τῷ ἀγνῷ δίδωται σοι τὸ αἷμα* &c. For vnder the Type or Species of bread his body is given thee, and vnder the type or species of wine his blood is given thee, that by taking this body and blood of Christ thou mayst be made partaker of his body and blood (*χερισθῶσαι γινώσκουσα*) and

A question  
answered,

The Testi-  
mony of S.  
Cyril of  
Hierusalem.

R



170 Disc. 1. C. 13. *Mr Stillingfleet abuses*

*All along  
most clear  
and signifi-  
cant.*

*The Church  
Speaks not  
in clearer  
terms.*

*Mr Stilling-  
fleet's im-  
probable.*

and so we shall be *Christophori*. Carrying Christ when we receive his body and blood into our members. Soon after he saith. Do not therefore consider this as meer bread and meer wine, for it is the body and blood of Christ according to his own words; for, although sense suggests that it is bread and wine, yet let faith Confirm thee, and do not judge of the thing by thy taste, but hold this most certain by thy Faith, that the body and blood of our Lord are given thee, so that there arise no doubt at all in thee. Again, towards the end of this Catechesis, he repeats and most energetically the verity he would have us learn. ταῦτα μαθὼν καὶ πληροφρονῆσαι οὐς ὁ φανερὸς αἶνος, οὐκ αἶνος ἐστὶν &c. Knowing and holding it most certain that the bread which is seen by vs is not bread, but the body of Christ; and the wine which is seen by vs, although it seem to the sense of our taste to be wine, yet it is not wine, but the blood of Christ. Thus this ancient Father and worthy Bishop speaks so significantly, that the witt of man shall neuer force on him any other sense but that which the Roman Catholick Church taught in the Council of Trent, and teaches to this day.

14. Now listen a little to Mr Stilling: glosses and try his Conscience, whether they have so much as a seeming probability? First he tells us it is evident (and it was for his purpose to cry Evident at the beginning) that Cyrills design here is to persuade the Catechumens (from whom the Mysterious presence of Christs body in the Sacrament was wont to be concealed) that the bread and wine were not meer common Elements, but designed for a higher use, to exhibit the body and blood of Christ to Believers. Is this, Sr, your Evident? As it evident that Cyril here intended to instruct the Catechumens only? We read that the Saint was a laborious Preacher and complied with that Charitable duty every Sunday, and day in Lent. Surely all who heard him were not Catechumens, and why may not these instructions contain part of that Doctrin he publickly delivered to his Auditors? All you can proue is that his first Catechesis was to the lately Baptized, but that this of the B. Sacrament concerned them only, is not probable. Turn to the Edition of S. Cyril Paris print 1609.

Y

You will find after the Dedicatory Epistle vnder this Title *De scriptis* Cyrill. That in his last five Mystagogical institutions he gave solid food and explicated the Diuine Mysteries of our Faith, of *Baptism*, *Chrism*, the *Eucharist*, and that great Sacrifice of the *Mass*, which Certainly belong to Christians of riper knowledge than Catechumens were. Again. It be euident that the Saint in this *Catechesis* concealed the Mysterious presence of Christ in the Sacrament, He missed extremely of his intent, for no Catholick can speak now with greater clarity of the Mystery, or more fully expresse the Churches sense then S. Cyril did about thirteen ages since. Yet one word. Say I beseech you what need was there then of concealing this Mysterious presence, it be no more but as you say, a piece of bread deputed to a holy vse, or a meer sign of Christs body present? Such a Mystery requires no secrecy at all, Catechumens might as well haue heard of it without torturing their vnderstandings, as now they hear of the Sacrament of Baptism. Lastly is it euident, that S. Cyril aimed at nothing but to show that bread and wine were not meer common Elements but things designed for a higher vse, or as you say, to Exhibit the body of Christ to Belieuers? Tis improbable, First because you add that to the Text which neither the words, nor the sense bear. S. Cyril saith. *Do not consider them as meer bread and wine*, Then he tell's you positively what they are. *For they are the body and blood of Christ*. Now your Gloss, designed for a higher vse to exhibit the body and blood of Christ to Belieuers, first Deads the very life of Cyrills words, and then run's into nonsense. I therefore Ask whether this gloss: *Bread and wine exhibit the body and blood of Christ to Belieuers*, saies. *Bread and wine really changed out of their nature, as water was at Cana in Galilee, are after that change as really Christs body and blood, as that water was really wine after Christs Miracle?* If your gloss say thus much, you are a plain Papist; if lesse, its none of S. Cyrills Doctrin, for the Saint deliuer's this as significantly, yet and more fully, then I now express it. I well vnderstand S. Cyrills sense by his words, but for my life I know not what you mean by your particule. *Exhibit*. Tellus I beseech you? How do bread and wine

S Cyril is  
made to  
misse of his  
ayme.

What is  
bread and  
wine to ex-  
hibit the  
body and  
blood of  
Christ

*Exhibit* the body and blood of Christ to Believers? Do they only mind vs of his body and blood? A Crucifix representing our Lord bleeding on a Crosse can well serue for so much. Do they shew or point vs out a Real presence of the same body and blood vpon the Altar which are now in heauen? If so; Belieuers haue an obieſt of Faith and that truth to fasten on which the Church teaches, but if your word *Exhibit* saies, or signifies less then this, or, only expressees your euer yet concealed *Sacramental* presence, you cheat the world with ambiguous dark Term's, and in good earnest know not what you say.

15. Answer therefore? *What is Christs body and blood to be Sacramentally present, when really they are not. vpon the Altar, but absent in Heauen only?* The question deserues an Answer, For you, Se, distinguish between a *Sacramental* and a *Corporeal* Presence, you grant the first, and deny the second. That which you grant is a Presence of Christs body and blood distinguished from the Catholick Real (or as you call it). *Corporeal* Presence: Vouchsafe to enlighten vs a little concerning it, which you page 574. seem to make real? There is, say you, a *Real presence of Christ in and with them* (that is, in and with bread, and wine) *to the soules of Belieues*. Very good. Giue vs I beseech you the total Obiect which these Soules haue before them when they belieue a Real presence of Christ *in and with bread and wine* vpon the Altar? Is this obieſt Christ himself whom they pull, as it were, by Faith out of Heauen at the time they receiue your piece of Bread? No. Christ still in Heauen, is yet Locally distant and therefore not really present *in and with bread and wine*, Vnless he be in two places at once. And Consequently the Faith of these Belieuers has no real Obiect *present* to fasten vpon. Is it that Christ is present in the Signes of bread and wine, as Caesar is in his Image? Pitiful. He is thus present in euery Crucifix, though really distant millions of Miles, This no way makes him actually there *in and with bread and wine*, as you Assert. Doth finally this your Obiectiue presence imply only thus much, that Christ by his power (though really absent) work's the same effects in a worthy Receiuer, as if he were actually there.

*Our Adversary is vexed to declare his sense.*

there? No. For he works the same effects, and (though absent) produceth grace by the Sacrament of Baptism as if he were present, dare you Therefore say he is in as peculiar à manner Really present, in and with the Water of Baptism, as he is in this Sacrament in and with bread and wine? Yet more. Such à Moral Presence directly contradict's Christ's words. *This is my body.* It directly contradict's S. Cyrills words. *Though it seem to the tast to be bread it is not bread, but the Body of Christs.* It directly contradict's that vnanswerable Truth: *As Water was changed into Wine, so Wine is changed into blood &c.*

*The Sallaries  
Sacramental  
Presence  
contradict's  
all Anthe-  
my.*

16. And thus, Sr, you see how impossible it is to giue your poor Belieuers any thing like à Real obiect, which may be called à *true Real Presence*; though I hold you obliged to help both them and me to à clear Notion of it: Because Christ's Sacred body and blood are Real things, you attribute to these two Real things à *true real Presence in and with bread and wine* (which cannot but denominate them really present with these two Substances vpon the Altar) Therefore you are obliged to tell me, what that is *A parte rei*, which I once more say, is impossible; For, as your Sacramental presence, in your sense, is à word no man vnderstand's, so your Doctrin is as wholly vnintelligible. Yet I haue not said all. In this your discourse of à Sacramental and Real presence, you would fain take some aduantage against vs by other words of S. Cyril. *Do not consider them as meer bread and wine, for they are the body and blood of Christ, according to his own word.* Hence you infer, it is plain, *He speaks of à Sacramental presence, for he doth not oppose the body and blood of Christ to the substance of bread and wine, but to meer bread, id est, That they should not look on the bread and wine as naked signes, but as Signa efficacia or efficacious signes.* Answ. Firſt The Saint has not à Syllable of either *signes* or *Signa efficacia*. Next, your Speculation about *meer bread*, is à meer nothing. For *meer bread*, is bread without Consecration, S. Cyril opposeth the body and blood of Christ present, to *meer bread*, Ergo He opposeth them to bread without Consecration, but bread without Consecration, or *meer bread*, is the very Substance of bread, Therefore he opposeth the body and

*No aduantage giuen  
Sallaries by  
any other  
words of S.  
Cyril.*

124 Disc. 1. C. 13. *Mr Stillingfleet abuses.*

blood of Christ present, to the substance of bread, vnless you can find the *Meerness* (might one speak so) or nakednes of bread distinct from its substance, which is not only improbable, but impossible.

*A more  
quibble about  
a word.*

17. Vpon this solid and vndeniable Ground, it imports your cause nothing, whether *σῶμα* in S. Cyril signifies, *Species*, as it is commonly rendred by Interpreters, or as you say, *that which doth figure or represent*, for, as long as this verity stand's vndoubted, that vnder the *Type* or *Species* of bread Christ gaue his own body, and That, that body is oppoled to the very *Substance of bread*, the expression is so clear and the same with our Catholick Doctrin, that were à hundred Glosses more laid vpon the word *σῶμα*, All would not do, nor rack it to any contrary meaning. You Reply S. Cyril speak's of such à presence as hath relation to the Receiuer. Speak out Sir. What is it, that has relation to the Receiuer only? The very *body and blood* of Christ vnder the *Type* of bread and wine (which are changed out of their nature as water was at Cana in Galilee) These substances of his body and blood, *as really present*, work their effect in à worthy Receiuer, where you euidently see, that the Real Presence of Christ's Sacred body and blood is *supposed* to the effect or to grace wrought in à Soul: Therefore to talk of à presence which hath relation to à Receiuer only, without the true supposed real verity of *Christ body and blood* present, is no more then à peruerse and an improbable Gloss, if S. Cyril speak sense.

*The change  
made in  
Christ  
wholly different  
from  
that in the  
Eucharist.*

18. Your next Gloss vpon these words. (*It is not bread though it seem to the east to be bread but the Body of Christ*) is worse if words can be, For you only frigidly say. *Hereby is meant no alteration in the Substance of it, but only that it is not That common Bread, it was before.* Sir, the contrary is now demonstratiuely proved against you. But you hope to help your self by an Instance which S. Cyril hath of Christ in his 3. *Mytag.* Pag. 525. where he Seem's to Parallel the change made in Christ, or holy oymntment, with the change of bread in the Eucharist. By the way. If Christ be à sacred à thing, it is à shame you haue no more vse of it in your Church

Church, but let that pass, and mark the Parallel and your own mistake with it. A change there is in both, bread and common ointment, but as different in Themselves as they are differently expressed by this Father. The one change is *Real* and *intrinsecal* made in the Substance of bread and wine, The change of common ointment is not so, but *Moral*. into a *grace*, or *Gift* of Christ. S. Cyrill's words take away all ambiguity. See, saith he, *That thou think not this ointment to be common or meer ointment, For as the bread of the Eucharist after the Invocation of the Holy Spirit is no longer common bread, but the body of Christ (here is the real change) So this holy ointment, is no longer naked or common ointment after it is consecrated* *ἡ ἁγία χριστοῦ χριστιανία*. but a *grace* or *Gift* of Christ, and the Holy spirit, which operates through the presence of the Divinity. Here is the other and a quite different change. Bread is made the *body* of Christ, Christ his *holy and sacred Gift*. The Parallel or parity therefore, as I now said, lies in this, That both bread and Common ointment are changed from what they were (and this is enough for Cyrill's intent who only proves Christ to be a holy thing) but it fails when he positively and expressly *diversifies* the nature of these changes, of bread into Christ's body, of Common ointment only into a *grace* or a *gift* of Christ. And Hence, Sr, your Question, whether we may not as well prove a Transubstantiation in the Christ as we do in the Eucharist, is both fond and frivolous. We Answer No, because the real change of bread into Christ's body fully expresseth Transubstantiation, the *Terminus à quo*, and *ad quem*, being *Real*, and *substantial*. The other Change of ointment into a Gift of Christ, denotes a moral change quite different and nothing like the other, which is most real.

19. Your next and last Gloss. abuses S. Amb. *De ip̄i qui in-  
stantur*. C. 9. who saith. Bread is no longer that which Nature has framed it, but that which the Benediction of Consecration has made it. You Answer. It is the body of Christ, but not in our gross sense. Pray Sr, Inform vs a little of your more quaint meaning? Say, how bread is Christ's body if it still remains as substantially bread after the Benediction, as water in Baptism remain's substantially water?

S. Cyrill's  
words denote  
the differen-  
ce.

S. Ambrose  
was cited, no  
less abused,  
than others.



water? Doth the water wherewith an infant is washed, cease to be water because it is a Sacrament? No certainly, yet bread if S. Ambrose speak truth, ceaseth to be that which nature framed it. You endeavour to make These words forceles, because S. Chrysost. in *Ad Rom.* 23. saith of Baptism, *It's virtue is so great that it sufficeth not men to be men,* and then you wisely ask whether we will grant it *Transubstantiat's them?* Friuolous. The Saint only speaks of the virtue of Baptism, which, as he obserues makes vs sons of Adoption, That is, it Changes a soul from the miserable state of Sin into a happy state of grace, and so permit's not men once infected with that leprosy, to be men as they were before, *vnergencate.* And therefore, he adds in the ensuing words. *The great power of the Holy Ghost is that it Transform's our Manners and maketh them compend.* What is here of any thing like *Transubstantiation*, or of a ceasing of that which nature hath framed? But enough and fully enough of Mr Stillingfleet's most improbable glosses, so I must and will term them, vntil some surer Principle than fancy giues them more strength which shall never be.

20. To end. I'll say a great Truth. Had this Gentleman twenty Cyprians, twenty Cyrills, twenty Austins as clear and express for his Opinion of the Sacrament, as the Testimonies now cited are significant for Catholick Doctrine: Had he a Church reputed Orthodox which as indubitably maintain'd his Opinion five or six ages since, as the Catholick Church then held, and yet hold's our Catholick Doctrine; Finally, had he Scripture as plain for his Sign or Figure of Christs body, as it is evidently clear for the Real Presence, I verily think no prudent man could or would belieue any thing of this great Mystery. And consequently all might rationally doubt of every article in Christian Religion: Because Fathers vpon the Supposition, are directly contrary to Fathers, Church, stand's against Church, and Scripture against Scripture. But now when he hath not one Clear Testimony of a Father, much less the Sentiment of any Orthodox Church, nor so much as a word of Scripture contrary to our Catholick Position, must Conclude that his Glosses already laid on these Fathers are not only improbable, but more than highly improbable. 21. Pe

Had this  
Adversary  
so much  
Authority  
for by opi-  
nion, as we  
Produce in  
behalfs of  
Catholick  
Doctrine No  
man Could  
believe any  
thing.

21. Perhaps Mr *Stillingfleet* may reply. His glosses, 'Tis true, because they are the Sentiments of a fallible man, are indeed lyable to error; but He bids me look well to my Refutations, and beware of setting to high a value on them whilst I oppose him, For my Opposition, (because I may mistake) amounts to no more, but to a weak de gree of Fallibility, so that, Hitherto He and I stand vpon equal Terms. Answ. If the contest be thus much only, whether his Glosses are not clearly refuted, the Iudicious Reader after a due Ponderation of my Replies, is so far to iudge between vs. But here is not all, I must Say more. Though I am as fallible in excepting against His glosses, as he is in making them, yet my Faith depends not vpon my *Exceptions* but vpon the Doctrin of my Church, The express words of Scripture, and Fathers; These oblige me vnder pain of damnation to belieue as I doe, But all that Mr *Stilling*: hath for his Faith, is only the vncertainty of his own coniectures (ancient Church he has none, nor express Scripture, nor one Clear sentence of any Ancient Father) And will hee Dare to oblige me vnder pain of damination to belieue his Glosses (or the opinion he would maintain by them) vpon no other Ground but his weak Coniectures? I appeal to his own Conscience for an Answer. Well. Be it how you will, thus much is euident (and 'Tis the only thing I aime at in this whole Discourse) if Scripture and Fathers be interpreted in high matters of Faith by two Adversaries of different Religions, when no surer Principle is at hand to rely on, but the fallible Glosses of the *One*, and a contrary fallible, combating with those Glosses in the *Other*, they may both (as the world goes now) sit long at the sport, before one Controversy be ended. Therefore God, as I said aboue, has Prouided vs of an easier way to end these weighty difficulties, or, we may Attum Scepticks. Some may say, The old mode of the World was to dispute by Scripture and Fathers, dare we reiekt this way of arguing as insufficient? Answ. No truely: It is an excellent way amongst Christians (though insignificant to Heathens) when the Aduerse Parties can Clear the sense of Scripture and Fathers vpon certain Principles, But if the very sense of Scripture and Fa-

No man  
builds faith  
vpon his own  
Glosses.

Others  
to and Con-  
trouersies  
that may  
Glosses

thers be called into Question As now à daies it is by *Sectaries*, We must of necessity haue Recourse to an other more Clear, easy, and indubitable means of ending all Debates euer in vs among the Holy Fathers, Whereof more afterward. In the *Interim* the ensuing Chapter may giue you entertainment.

## CHAP. XIV.

*It is further proued that neither Scripture alone, nor any other Principle distinct from an Vnerring Church, can with certainty decide Controuersies in Matters of Religion, or Regulate Christian Faith.*

1. **T**HIS Assertion not slightly proued in the other Treatise Disc. 2. C. 4. I hold so certain, That the wit of man shall not rationally contradict it. And to giue yet more light to what is there said, Be pleased to exclude, or mentally only to set aside All thought of an vnerring Church, of her *infallible Tradition*, so, of the Definitions of General Councils, For all these (which *Sectaries* hold fallible) are *Essential* to an vnerring Church, If any such thing be in the world, whereof we shall Treat afterward. Next look about you, And consider well what remain's to end Controuersies withall, or to regulate Diuine Faith. You haue first Scripture which à Pagan wholly and à Iew partly reiects, Ye with such Aliens from Christ, à Christian can argue rationally, and clearly conuince them, as I shall proue in the second Discourse. After Scripture, you haue the sublime Mysteries of Faith, the Fathers Doctrin laid forth in their Volumes, and the History of the Church. Here are all the Principles imaginable left *Sectaries*, besides their priuate Spirit; which can be no more à sound Principle to them, than the contrary *spirit* is to Their Aduersaries.

*What Principles Sectaries can pretend to, distinct from an infallible Church.*

2. Let vs now See how weakly the Sectary endeavours to end any Controuersy by these Principles without an infallible Church, And be pleased euer to attend to the Aduersary he Treat's with. If he attempt's to do good on à *Heathen* by Scripture, or bring's in the Reasonableness of Christian Religion, The Heathen, and Iew also laugh at his Folly, And wish him to proue his Book to be Diuine. If he proues that by the Vniuersal Tradition of all Called Christians, the Heathen perhaps will not yet quarrel with him (as I may hereafter) about the Fallibility or Infallibility of Tradition, but desires him to goe among the *Chinenses* and lay his Bible down by *that* book which their supposed Prophet *Confusius* wrote, full of excellent Moral Precepts. Thus much done the Contest Begin's. The Sectary saith his Bible is Authorized by à great *Prophet*, called *Christ*. A learned Bonzius Answer's, and his is also Authorized by à great *Prophet* called *Confusius*. The Sectary saith all Christians own his book (vpon à neuer interrupted Tradition) to be indited by the Spirit of Truth, The Bonzius replies, All China of à mighty vast Extent age after age, hath the like perpetuated Tradition for his Bible. What followes but that These two Aduersaries, peruse their Bibles? The Bonzius read's ours, and Reasonably ask's, whether the Sectary can infallibly proue such strange Mysteries as are registred there, (for example, à *Trinity*, the *Incarnation of the Diuine Word*) to be Truths Reuealed by Almighty God? The Sectary answers. All the *infallible certainty* *in both of these particular Verities* lastly Relies only vpon Scripture it selfe. For what euer Principle can be imagined distinct from *that* *Written Word* whether *Church* or *Tradition*, is Fallible and may deceive. Ifso, saith the Heathen your Bible gain's no Credit with me, Because you proue the Mysteries contained there by that which *causes my doubt*, or is the matter in Question, for you say all I read, is of Diuine inspiration because your Bible relates them, and therefore make that à proof of your Doctrin, which is the Matter in question, *or causes my doubt*. O saith the Sectary read on with Humility and you will find, that the very *Majesty of the style*, the *Energy of the words* will quit you of doubting; And to ease you of too

*The Protestant's  
Contest with à  
Heathen  
Concerning  
the Bible.*

*The Hea-  
then except's  
against the  
Protestants  
plea.*

much pains, know we Protestants hold That the Belief of a very few chief Articles, or simple Truths (as that *Iesus is the Christ: the Diuine Word is incarnated &c*) is faith enough to gain Heauen. Contra. Replies the Heathen. I see no other Maiesty in the Style of your Bible than in mine, and other pious books. The exterior Syntax or ioyning of words together is common to all such Writings. But about all I wonder why you talk to me of no man knows what splendor shining in the bare Letter, when you say that shines not to Pagans, but only to those who haue the Spirit of God, and are the Elect amongst you. Now to what you Add of a few chief Articles necessary to be believed and no more, I answer first. Your Scripture saith no such Thing, nor tell's me or you which Articles are necessary, which not, and if it did so, you are only where you were before in darkness. Since you proue not so much as one of these few Articles to be of Diuine Reuelation, *but by the book which records them*; And this you do whilst I iustly question not only the book, but the Truth of this very article, which you make Diuine, *because it is in your Bible*. But enough of this subject at present, whereof see more C. 9. n. 7. All that is said there and further enlarged here, makes this Truth not only probable but demonstratiuely euident. That Scripture alone is no vniuersal Meane to end Controuersies debated between *Christians* and no *Christian* (which is the only Thing we now insist on) yet *Iesus Christ* hath left sufficient means whereby such Aliens may be reclaimed from their Errours, and attain saluation. Scripture doth it not for all, Therefore a more satisfactory way must be thought of.

*The Fathers  
of no Autho-  
rity with a  
Heathen.*

3. Now if we begin to speak of the Fathers with a learned Heathen, 'tis labour lost, for He who believes not the Diuinity of Scripture will little regard the Fathers Authority. To tell a Heathen of the high Mysteries of our Faith augment's his Difficulties, puzzles Reason, and rack's his vnderstanding. To weary him with a long narration of Ecclesiastical history is most impertinent, when as yet, He neither believes Scripture, nor Fathers. Yet this man may be conuerted to Christian Religion if he followes Reason, Unless we say which is intolerable to hear, That our

Lost

Lord Iesus will haue this poor man lost, or left without means to attain Saluation by.

4. The next Aduersary the Protestant may attaque shall be, if you please, à Roman Catholick (we will here to gain time omit his Contest with Arians and other Hereticks) And his whole endeavour, if he goe Closely to work, must either be to Establish his own Protestant Tenets by Scripture, Fathers, and Antiquity, or forceably to dissuade all by virtue of these Principles from the Belief of our Catholick Doctrin. I say it is impossible to do either, Because the Sectary has not in the whole Bible one clear and expres Text for any one Tenet of Protestantcy as it's reformed; Nor so much as one clear and expres Text against any one Doctrin of the Roman Catholick Religion. Therefore, as Scripture cannot Pass an obligation on him to believe one Article of his new Faith; so it cannot oblige him or me to disbelieve one Article of our Roman Catholick Doctrin, For vpon this supposition, it neuer meddles with the one, and often omit's to speak of the other, in plain, open and significant Terms. For example. Scripture neither expressly denies Transubstantiation with the Protestant, nor in that plain open Term affirm's it with the Catholick: it neither clearly Saies there are Two Sacraments only; nor in expres Words allowes of Seven: It neither clearly denies Purgatory; nor vnder that express Word asserts it. How then can the Protestant when he hath not one clear syllable in Scripture for what he hold's in these particulars, nor à word against our contrary Doctrins, euer probably venture to decide these and the like controuerted Matters by the plain and expres letter of the Bible? It is impossible. The Reason is, it cannot determine that whereof it speaks not clearly, nor become an intellectual Rule, or Measure whereby we are to iudge what's true, or what's false concerning these controuersies, if it Meddles not with them in expres Terms. I say in express Terms: For what euer is less then that, or not express, must either bee the Sectaries Gloss or his fallible Deduction, I reiect both, and appeal to him who wrote the original Book with all it's candor and simplicity. If I find Protestantcy there, well and good; If otherwise, no Gloss no De-

*The sectaries  
attempt  
vpon Catho-  
licks,  
vain, and  
why.*

*Not one  
Text in  
Scripture  
clear for  
Protestancy  
nor one  
against Ca-  
tholick  
Doctrin.*



duction shall preuail with me to belieue the Nouelty vnder pain of damnation, vnless he who tampers with à Text, first, bid's me to belieue vnder pain of damnation that he is an vnerring man, or that his Glosses or deductions are infallible, which I am sure is not Gods command. Again, If I find nothing plain and expresse in Scripture against my Catholick Doctrin (but much for it) I should be worse then foolish to change my ancient Faith vpon the slight ground of farfetch't Glosses and fallible inferences.

*It's Affertion  
is a, proud.*

5. Shall I say yet more clearly what I here aime at? Some Christians there are now in being who Belieue, the true Doctrin of Christ so firmly, that though an Angel preach't Contrary (Galat. 1. 8.) They ought not to be removed from it; if therefore Protestants belieue their own Doctrin so stedfastly, and say that Papists (for example) err in the Belief of Christ's true Doctrin, they are to Euidence it by à more indubitable Principle, than that is which the Apostle vnderstand's *by the preaching of an Angel*. But such à Principle can be no other nor less certain than plain and open Scripture. How Therefore can the Protestant so much as weakly hope to dissuade from Popery and perswade to his opinions by meer guesles, weak inferences, weightles coniectures &c. without plain Scripture? Now to shew you he hath no more but, guesles. Let him please to Discuss rigidly with me but one point in Controuersy *by Scripture only*. That of Transubstantiation wherein he think's to haue most Advantage, may perhaps occur, and like him best. I say after All he can allege for his opinion, or against our Catholick Doctrin shall be no more but meer *Coniectures, improbable Glosses, vncertain Topicks, false Suppositions* and the like; And are these think you weighty enough to establish his Opinion which he hold's to be reuealed Doctrin? No. certainly. The Doctrin of Christ stand's so sure vpon certain known Grounds that an Angel though he preach otherwise, is not to be belieued, and if it be not thus stedfastly founded, it is not as I obserued aboue, Christ's Doctrin. How easy were it for the Sectary to end much of these debates by à due examination of this one Controuersy. I vrge him to it, yet you'll see, he will refuse this Modest Challenge.

*meer Coniectures  
are Protestants only  
proofs.*

6. Where

6. Wherefore I shall neuer comprehend why these men trouble the world as they do with writing Controuersies. What is their aime? Is it to draw any one Soul to Protestancy, or only to giue a proof of wit, and show that they can speak against God's truths which an Angel cannot Disswade from? If this later be intended, the Arians of old did so before them, And the Diuel can do it much better than either Arian or Sectary: If it be to conuert men to Protestancy, The Attempt is desperate, vnless they come strongly armed with plain, express, and Significant Scripture, Whereof there is no fear at all; For had they clear Scripture against one sort of their supposed erring Christians (Papists for example) they would not spare vs one whit, but most willingly Silence vs with Gods own plain language. This we look for, but in lieu of it, what haue we? *Fancies, Coniectures, Glosses, frivolous Discourses.* And thus forsooth Popery must down (I marry) and Protestancy be thought the pure and most refined Religion.

7. By what is said already you see how vnluckily these men run out of the way of all probable Arguing, whilst Scripture is made so clear, that by the light thereof, All Controuersies now raised amongst dissenting Christians, can be determined. Is it so conuincing and clear? Proue you no Purgatory, no Inuocation of Saints by plain and express Scripture. Is it so conuincing and clear? Proue you plainly that to deny *Purgatory* or *Transubstantiation*, is as necessary to Saluation as to deny a Quaternity of Diuine Persons. Now if it be not clear in such matters. Why keep you a coile about these Negatiues? Why do you threaten vs with God's iudgements for maintaining the Contrary Doctrins? Why haue you not only made an uproar in the world about Doctrins meerly vnecessary, but more (which may lay sorrow at your hearts) why haue you shamefully separated your selues from an Ancient Church, whereof your Ancestors were members? And this is desperately done for a Company of *Negative Opinions*. Though it import's not one straw whether they be believed or no. Contrariwise, if you make the Belief of these Non-Articles necessary to Saluation they must be proved by the plain and express word of God, which is

*Sectaries  
argue im-  
probably.*

*Negative  
Opinions,  
the cause of  
Sectaries  
Separation.*

utterly

vterly impossible, and therefore I said right, that Scripture cannot end Controuersies between dissenting Christians, *Catholicks* for example and *Protestants*.

8. And thus much in effect our Newer men grant who talk much of a few simple Truths sufficient to saluation called fundamentals. *Is it not enough* saith Dr Taylor in his. 2. Dissuasiue. P. 161. *That we are Christians, that we put all our hope in God who freely giues vs all things by his son Iesus Christ? That we are redeemed by his Death, that we are members of his body in Baptism. that he giues vs his spirit, that we do no Evil, that we do what good we can &c. Is not this Faith and Righteousness, and the Confession of this faith sufficient vnto saluation?* Obserue well. If such a faith of a few Nouellists, and the like simple Truths which no Arian denies vnder such general Terms (and cannot be proued sufficient by plain Scripture) be enough to Saluation, what need had Sectaries to Calumniate our ancient Church, and expose Christianity to the scorn of Iewes and Athies for lesser Matters (as they think) than these fundamentals, or for simple truths are? Do we disown any of them? No. We are Christians as well as they, we put our hope in God, we say all things are giuen vs by his son Iesus Christ, we are redeemed by his Death &c. Wherein then lies our Offence? O, we hold strange Nouelties, *Inuocation of Saints, Purgatory, Transubstantiation*. These they are Nouelties, but be it as you will, They are out of the *your simple Truths*, and in your Principles no more but *Opinions*, and can you haue such cruel hearts as to persecute vs, banish, wash our blood for meer Opinions? Where is your Charity? Again I argue *ad hominem*. If to hold a Purgatory be only an Opinion, your denying it is no more but an opinion also, Therefore you cannot proue your Negative by plain and express Scripture, for if you do so, it will be no longer an Opinion, but a *manifest Truth*, and certain Doctrine. Continue this if you can and tell vs that Scripture decides all Controuersies between vs, or has an obligation on vs to belieue more then *These few simple Truths* as *No Purgatory* for example, *No Transubstantiation*; or say plainly that Scripture doth not put an end to these Controuersies; *that Truth is eident by manifest Experience.*

*Of Sectaries  
simple  
Truths.*

9. It is strange to see how endlesse Sectaries are, and to no purpose at all, in quoting Fathers for the Clarity and sufficiency of Scripture in all things necessary, but afterward spoil all with a new Whimsy, For they make iust so much as they please (a few Simple Truths serve the turn) to be Necessary and sufficient. Here are three insuperable difficulties. First. They speak without book; For God neuer told them in Scripture how many or how few of these Truths, are necessary and *Sufficient*; Therefore if I admit this Principle, the Protestants sole Word must secure me, though I know well, that their word is neither a necessary, nor a sufficient warrant for my saluation. Hence. 1. I vrge them to show by plain Scripture the number of these fundamentals precisely necessary. 2. I must tell them. If Scripture be clear in a few Fundamentals and so much only be necessary and sufficient, this reasonable Question may well follow. What's the rest of the Bible good for with them? Most certainly the far greater part of it, where it speaks not of these few Necessaries, may be cast away as vfeless and impotent. 3. These Nouellists Pronounce, and Proue against themselves, in all such Controuersies as are now in debate between them and Catholicks, For, if Scripture which tell's vs of all Necessary and Sufficient things to saluation (comprised in a few simple Truths whereof there is no strif now) omit's, whilst it mentions these, to speak plainly in behalf of our Protestant Opinions. No *Sacris*. No *Transubstantiation*. &c. With what Conscience can they tell vs (and They haue often said it) that this Book alone can decide these controuersies, and recall vs from Popery to their new mode of Protestancy? I would willingly haue Satisfaction to this one difficulty.

*Scripture  
says: not  
how many  
are necessary.*

*Sectaries  
proue against  
themselves.*

an. Well: To answer all they can pretend to out of the ancient Fathers for the Clarity and sufficiency of scripture in order to things necessary, be pleased to obserue, that the learned Tertallian against Marcion (but chiefly in his book *de Prescript*: cap. 16. at these words. *We are not to recurre to Scripture, wherein there is no strif, or a very uncertain one &c.*) And S. Iustin, S. Chrysostome with others, may perhaps seem, to a less diligent Reader, to be of contrary

T

contrary

Two parts of  
Scripture,  
distingui-  
shed,

trary iudgements. *Tertullian* now cited, saies Scripture is insufficient to decide Controuersies concerning Religion amongst Christians. *S. Austin. De Bapt. Contra Donat* : lib. 2. C. 6. plead's much for it's sufficiency. I say here is no Contrariety : both speak well, both deliuer Catholick Doctrin. Know therefore, that Scripture is deuided into two Parts or *Sections*, as you may read in *Sixtus Senensis. Lib. 6. Btbl. Annot* : 152. Who cites *S. Chrysostom* for it. The one vsually called *Pars Directa*, or direct part treat's of the abstruse Mysteries of Christian Faith, and this ( which is Matter of Contest between vs and Sectaries ) *Tertullian* reiect's, and hold's insufficient to end disputes, And so doth *S. Austin* alio. *Epistola. 49. Ad Deo gratia.* The other named, *Pars reflexa* and the clearer which speak's of the Foundation of Christian Religion, of the Extent of the Church diffused the whole world ouer, of its marks and Signes, of its Perpetuity, and infallible Assistance, of Nations flocking to it, &c. This part, I say (the book being once admitted as of Gods Diuine word) is so perspicuous, and clear that it silences all Sectaries and evidently subuert's their Errours. But to tell me, it is clear and sufficient enough to decide differences, when we dispute with contentious men about the particular Mysteries of Faith ( the *Trinity*, for example, *Transubstantiation*, the number of Sacraments &c.) And the very sense of Scripture, which should end all, is not agreed on by the two dissenting Parties; To assert this I say, is not only à Paradox but à manifest improbability contrary to all experience, And therefore I will extract this confession from our Aduersaries ( may they please to answer ) that as they shall neuer proue one of their Protestant Opinions, so, they shall neuer oppugn one Catholick Doctrin, by clear and express Scripture.

*S. Austin's  
Discourse,  
with an  
Arian.*

11. Some obiekt *S. Austin* disputing against *Maximinus* an Arian, who saith, Lib. 3. C. 4. 14. *Sed unus nec ego Nicenum &c.* Barrow, neither I ought to allege the Nicene Council, nor thou that of Ariminum, neither am I bound to the Authority of the one, nor thou to the Authority of the other. Let vs contend by the Authorities of Scripture which are common Witnesses to vs both. Here two things seem clear. First, That *S. Austin* reiected the Authority of the Nicene Council, as Sectaries do

do now the Church. 2. That He held Scripture à sufficient Rule to convince an Arian. A word only in passing. Dare the Sectary offer thus much, or dispute with the Catholick for the supposed Truths of pure Protestancy, or his Negative Articles by Scripture only, as he here supposeth S. *Austin* did Argue in other Matters with Maximinus? I would willingly see some attempt made this way, but am sure, He will not dare to do it. Because he saith His Protestancy, or these Negatives are not revealed, but only à number of inferior truths which cannot be proved by Scripture. To what purpose then is it to allege any Testimony which makes Scripture sufficient to decide Controuersies, when the Protestant ingenuously grant's he can prove nothing of his pure Protestancy by plain Scripture? Hence I Say all the Quorations of Fathers haled in to prove the sufficiency of Scripture, help not the Sectary at all. *Irenæus*, for example, call's it the Rule of Faith. S. *Austin*. A Divine Balance. *Theophilus Alex*: a firm foundation. *Gerson*, A Sufficient and infallible Rule. Most true if we speak of the scriptures Clearer part, yea and of the obscurer also, when it is interpreted by an infallible Oracle. But what makes all this for pure Protestancy, or for its Negative Opinions? Doth Scripture regulate this new Faith, whereof it is vterly silent? Doth it weigh such Negatives, or tell vs what they are worth? Is it à firm Foundation to establish these Fancies? A sufficient and infallible Rule which measures vs out, No Sacrifice on the Altar, No purgatory, No Transubstantiation? Toyes, trifles. There is not à word spoken in the whole Bible contrary to the opposit Verities of Catholick Religion, or in behalf of Protestancy. Therefore though S. *Austin* appeal'd to Scripture against an Arian, and had his reasons for it, yet our new mens Plea is more then impertinent, when after their Appeal they find not one sentence for Protestancy, or against Catholick Doctrin. Now to S. *Austin*.

Observe the question here proposed.

Sectaries quote Fathers to no purpose.

12. I say first, The Saint reiected not the Authority of the Nicene Council which he ever honoured, but only waived that as an vnder Principle in his contest with Maximinus, who no more regarded the Nicene Definitions, than Sectaries now do the Council of

Why S. *Austin* waived the Nicene Council.



Trent, Therefore as we Argue not from that Council against them, so S. *Austin* then argued not from the Nicene Definitions. Thus our Catholick Writers haue answered à hundred times, yet we must haue this *Crambe recolla* serued vp again, as à new vnfauory Objection. I say. 2. S. *Austin* by his Appeal to Scripture recurs's not to the bare letter, which he saith, *is à body without à Soul*, but to the true genuine Sense Thereof, which he supposeth known in that Scripture which we call the *Reflex part*, and yet is more clearly known by the Vniuersal consent of Christs vnerring Church. For it is one and the same thing with S. *Austin*, to belieue the Churches sense of Scripture, and to belieue Scripture is self, which most manifestly commend's vnto vs Church Authority. Had then the Saint argued thus against his Aduersary, He had conuinc'd him by the Clearer Part of Scripture. Though thou exceptest against the Nicene Council, yet thou can'st not deny, but that Scriptura commend's à Church founded by Christ, diffused the whole World over; what euer Therefore this Church deliue's concerning the sense of Scripture, That is the sense of the Holy Ghost, And can be no other for à Church which sweernes from the true sense of Gods Word, is no Church founded by Christ. But the Vniuersal Sentiment of this Church opposeth thy error, Therefore the true sense of Scripture which this Church plainly deliue's, stand's opposit to thee al, And thus thou art conuinc'd by Scripture it self.

*What if S.  
Austin had  
argued from  
the Direct  
part of  
Scripture?*

13. Perhaps you will ask whether if S. *Austin* had argued from the Obscure Part only which treats of à *Mysterious Trinity*, or God in Essence, and three distinct Persons, not so plainly expressed there, He could then haue conuinc'd his Arian Aduersary of error. None can better satisfy the doubt than S. *Austin* himself. *Lit. contra Cresconium* C. 33. where he speaks of an other Matter of Faith. viz. of Baptism conferred by Hereticks, which though not clearly expressed in Scripture, is yet held à true and valid Sacrament. His words are. *Proinde quamuis huius rei certè de Scripturis Canonicis non proferatur exemplum &c.* Although no example of this thing (the validity of Baptism by Hereticks) can certainly be Shown by Scripture yet the Verity of thesè Scriptures is held by vs in this particular. *Cum hoc facimus quod vniuersa iam placuit Ecclesiæ,*

when

when we now do that which pleases, or is agreeable to the Vniuersal Church, which Church, the Authority of Scripture it self commend's. *Præ quoniam*, As that because the Holy Scripture cannot deceive ( whilst it commend's the Church ) and every one fears to be deceived in the obscurity of this Question: *Eandem Ecclesiam de illâ consulat*. Let him consult the Vniuersal Church of this particular, Which holy Scripture without all ambiguity doth demonstrat. Thus most profoundly *s. Austin*. And he giues an Answer to the present difficulty. viz. That if the Obscure Part of Scripture speak not plainly in the debate betwixt him and an Heretick, the Heretick is to address himself to the Church and learn by Her what the sense of Scripture is. Without light borrowed from the Church, we haue only words about these high Mysteries, but not fully *sens'd words*, chiefly when we argue with contentious Sectaries, whose glosses deprave the plainest Passages in Holy writ, as the Protestants doth Christ's clear Proposition. *This is my body*. If therefore we go on in such a contest with words not fully sens'd, we may well end our lines, as *s. Austin* notes, before we end one Controversy.

*s. Austin  
himself  
Answers.*

14. And thus you see, as the One Part of Scripture is a body without a soul before it be received by the Church; so the Other Part is also, before it be both receiued and sens'd by this Oracle of Truth. Vpon this ground all those other Testimonies vially alleged by Sectaries out of *s. Austin* against the *Donatists*, Of *Optatus* *Mileuitanus*, and *s. Chrysostom* for the clarity of Scripture are clearly solued, for here is *s. Austin* Principle. *The sense of Scripture intended by the Holy Ghost, and the sense of Christs true Church concerning Scripture, can neuer clash, but is one and the same*. If therefore I know the sense of the Church, I haue with it the sense of Scripture also, but with this difference, That what Scripture often expressees less clearly, Christ's Church deliueers more fully, and Explicitly. Whence it follows that if the Churches sense conclude against these Sectaries, the Scriptures sense, where it is obscure, is in like manner concluding.

*The sense  
of Scripture  
and the  
Church al-  
waies the  
same.*

15. You may object Scripture is in the noblest manner in-

T 3

fallible,

fallible, For it hath its infallibility from God immediatly, and may well be a distinct Rule, or Principle, from that sense which the Church giues of it. Why therefore should not Sectaries haue recourse to that *first* and *noblest* Principle without relying on the Churches interpretation? I haue answered, because they know not (guesse they may and misse) what Scripture saies in a hundred difficult Passages. Therefore they are to recurr to the Church, or must make vse of their own fancies to sense it. The Argument, purely fallacious, is much to this sense. Christ our Lord when he taught his Disciples was in the noblest manner infallible, *Truth it self*, the Apostles were only infallible in their teaching and further Explanation of those Verities they learn'd, by a Singular Grace or participation of Infallibility. Why then should not Sectaries rely only on the first sure Principle, *Christ's own Doctrine* flowing from the Fountain of infallibility, without depending on the Apostles Doctrin, *not so eminently infallible*? Now be pleased to hear *S. Austin* pondering those words. Psal. 57. *alienationem peccatorum*. &c. Where he makes this Parallel betwixt Christ and the Church, and solues the Difficulty. *Ex veritate ora agnosco Christum ipsam veritatem*. Taught by the mouth of Truth, I acknowledge Christ Truth it self, *ex veritate ora agnosco Ecclesiam participem veritatis*. And by the same mouth of Truth, I acknowledge the Church partaking also of Verity. That is, I own the Church to be, not *Truth it self*, not *Scripture it self*, but a *Co-partaker* in Truth, with *Christ*, and *Scripture*. I own it to be, not *Infallible it self*, yet so eminently infallible by a singular grace or *participated Infallibility*. That to dispute against it is *most insolent madness*. Witness the same *S. Austin*. *Epist. 118. C. 5. ad Iulium*: If he dur to do so, Saith the Saint, *Serm. 14. de verbis Apost. C. 28. oratio violentius against this impregnable Wall of the Church*. Let him know his doom. *ipse confringitur* He is shattered in pieces. Hence you see first, that no mans priuate Iudgement can be contrary to the Churches sense giuen of Scripture, without thwarting Scripture it self. You see. 2. That Scripture and the Church are not two Principles, looking as it were different waies, but one and

An Objection  
answered.

the same, in order to our direction and regulating Faith. whereof more Hereafter.

*Scripture  
and the  
Church in  
order to all  
is one Prin-  
ciple.*

16. In the mean while you may ask, why our Sectaries keep such a Coile about the Clarity of Scripture concerning things necessary? It is hard to say what they drive at, For if all this pretended clarity diffused it self through euery passage of Holy writ, worse it is for them, and to their vtter confusion. Obserue My reason. The more clear Scripture is made by Nouellists, the greater is their shame, whilst they cannot proue by it's supposed clarity so much as *one Protestant Doctrin*, nor probably oppugne *one Article of our Catholick Faith*. Therefore nothing is gained this way: Nay all is lost by Their casting off Church Authority, when after that *Wicked Fact*, clear Scripture leaues them as *Scripturelesse*, as Their own malice has made them *Churchlesse*. It is true. I see some Colour for their Pre-  
 fence to Scripture, and thus it is. Like men lawlesse, they haue shaken of all other receiued Principles of Christian Religion. *Speak of a Church*, She is fallible, and has actually erred. *Cite Fathers*, some pitifully gloss them, others roundly reiect them as men meerly Fallible. Mention Tradition, the very word is odious. Now for stark shame, whilst they bear the name of Christians, it is hard to throw away all Christian Principles. What's done therefore? I tell you. They lay hold of a *body* without a *soul*, I mean, the bare letter of Scripture without the Sense, and this is all that's left them. I say *without the sense*, whereof you haue seen enough already, for when the sense of God's word is controuerted between them and vs, and their sense runs contrary to the receiued Church Doctrin, no probable Principle can make it defensible, and vpon this Ground I said right, They are as *Scripturelesse* as *Churchlesse*. All this is most true, and I well vnderstand it. But why these men labour so earnestly to make the Bible plain, when not so much as one plain passage is found there for Protestant; or against our Catholick Doctrin, is a Riddle aboue my reach, I vnderstand it not. Let then as much as you will of the book be clear, whilst the Clarity fauours not one of our Sectaries forged Nouelties, nor Contradict's one of our Catholick Tenets, it neither helps the Protestant

*Why Secta-  
ries take  
recourse to  
the bare  
letter of  
Scripture.*

Protestant nor hurt's the Catholick. In the next Discourse we shall treat of the Church, and more oportunately solve there a few objections of Sectaries.

## CHAP. XV.

*The other mentioned Principles above are insufficient to decide controversies, Or to Regulate Faith.*

**T**He next Principle after Scripture, we named the Mysteries of Christian Religion, which certainly cannot regulate Faith, or determine Controversies concerning Religion. For a Rule is the measure whereby we judge what is true and what is false, but no man judges this by the Mysteries themselves *Believed*, because these proposed without further light, are not only obscure but highly Transcend all natural discourse, And therefore Reason would reject them, were it not curb'd and rectified by an other Superior most certain and infallible Rule, distinct from the Mysteries. A further ground and more *a Priori* is. That man who Judges of Religion by the Mysteries believed, makes, in real truth his own fancy or weak reason to regulate Faith, and is sure to err. He shew you how. Give me one, as yet not seduced in any Faith, that cast's his thoughts upon all the different Religions now Professed in the world, *Judaism, Mahometism, and Christianity*. He call's them all to the Tribunal of his Reason which is guided by the Mysteries of each Profession, And is resolved to pitch on so much, as seem's suitable to his Judgement. Reason certainly, if it proceed *Reasonably*. will only pick out of every one, such Mysteries as are Facile, and no way torture an Understanding. Much may displease this Seeker after Truth in *Judaism*, yet perhaps not all. The filth and Fooleries in *Turkism* like him not

What weak Reason would embrace if left to it self.

yet something he may approue. Finally he fall's vpon Christianity and there find's those insuperable difficulties of à *Trinity*, the *Incar-nation*, *Original sin* &c. These suite not with his Reason, and consequently are reiecte'd, Therefore (if Christianity be true) à false Religion cannot but haue more sway with him, than the vndoubted reuealed Verities of Iesus Christ. Thus much seem's clear. Perhaps you will ask why I instance in an *Vnbelieuer*, who is yet to chuse his Religion? When I should show that Christians, euen those we call Sectaries, ought not to end Controuersies or to regulate their Faith by the apparent easines, or difficulty of Mysteries within the bounds of Christianity, whereof many are in dispute between them and Catholicks. Answ. I haue instanced thus on set purpose to lay open the great Errour of all Sectaries, who leauing the Conduct of Christ's Church run along with this *supposed Vnbelieuer*. For as he, after à consideration had of seuerall Mysteries found in the Religions now named, takes out of each what is easiest, and best likes his Fancy, or weak reason; So Sectaries proceed, Though they walk in à lesser compass, and for the most part limit Themselves to something taught by men called Christians, whether true or false, imports not. Within such bounds they take and leaue as freely what pleaseth, as any *Vnbelieuer* doth, and vsually throw off Mysteries most difficult to sense and Reason. Thus the Arian reiect's à Trinity because it is à hard Mystery, and not plainly exprest in Scripture. The Pelagian denies Original sin vpon the same ground, and Protestants thunder against *Transubstantiation*, because the word is not in Holy Writ, and the Mystery seem's repugnant to their Reason. All therefore are alike as ill Self-chusers with in such à compass as any *Vnbelieuer*, who makes à new Religion on his own head, guided by no other Rule, but fancy, or what seem's to him reasonable. The sole cause of this Self-chusing, is the Sectaries falling off from the conduct of Christs vnerring Oracle, *The Church*, which tell's them what God speak's. This vnfortunately slighted, They make him speak iust so much as they think fit, or seem's good to their weak and fallible Reason.

*These who yet believe nothing and Sectaries, are alike in their Choice Of Religion,*



154 *Disc. 1. C. 13. Other Principles insufficient.*

*Protestants  
doe and must  
except  
against the  
Authority of  
Fathers.*

*because the  
Fathers are  
fallible, and  
teach Popery.*

2. The next Principle, Sectaries may lay hold on for à sufficient, or at least à Subordinate and concurrent means to decide Controversies, and regulate Faith, is the Authority of the ancient Fathers. Though Catholiks highly honour these great Lights of the Church, And no way decline the tryal, yet they think an easier Rule can be assigned for all, and know well that Protestants doe and must except against this very Rule. One exception is. The labour is immense to peruse exactly the large volumes of Fathers (the like is of Councils) which can only be done by the more learned of different Religions. However, suppose the work performed by à learned Catholick and à learned Protestant, and that both diligently read the Fathers, The satisfaction given to the Generality of other Christians is very little or nothing, who first must Hear, what These two men report, and next credit their dissenting Judgements. And can such judgement think ye thus at variance (as they have been for à hundred years) certainly regulate Divine Faith in à Seeker after truth, or in debates wheron Salvation depend's? It is impossible. Again These Fathers with Sectaries, even all of them put together, are fallible and may teach False Doctrin: Nay more, They have actually taught it, say Protestants, and grossly erred, whilst they openly maintained à true. *Sacrifice upon the Altar, prayers for the dead, Invocation of Saints, Translation of Saints Reliques and their worship, the grimages to Holy places, Auricular Confession to à Priest, vnwritten Tradition, vnwed Chastity, the Hallowing of Altars, of Churches, of Wine, bread, oyle, candles, And the great virtue of the sign of the Holy Cross, &c.* These say Protestants, and innumerable others have been the foule mistakes of Fathers, and Therefore Mr whitaker plainly affirm's Popish Religion to be à Patched coueler of the Fathers errors soild together; And D. Humfrey highly blames Mr. Jewell for his so bold Appeal to the Fathers, *saying becaus he gave the Popists too large à Scope, was injurious to himself* (And) *after à manner spoiled himself, and the Church &c.* The words of these two Sectaries are cited, and relate them, in the Protestants Apology. Tract 1. Sect. 3. subd. 14. Page (with me) 128. And neuer Adversary could yet Tax that

Author

Author of a false Quotation, who also through the Seuerall passages of his book shewes, how Sectaries ascribe the now named and supposed errors to the Fathers. It would be tedious, to expose all his laborious Collections on this subiect to common view again. Who euer desires further Satisfaction, need's only to bring eyes, to open the book, and read his Marginal notes. Thus much premised.

3. I say. The Fathers that are not only fallible, but also supposed by Sectaries to haue actually wronged Truth, can be no Appendant or subordinate, much less any sufficient Rule of faith for them, when these conceited Errors are so numerous. That all along they stick most Close to our Catholick Doctrine, as is largely proued in the Protestants *Apology*. Some perhaps will say we must haue recourse to such passages of Fathers as only treat of Fundamentals, and so farre are vnexceptionably plain: Answ. what need of this, when Protestants say there is no great difference between vs in Fundamentals? But suppose this done, which yet cannot be done, whilst Sectaries remain in their wonted Labyrinth concerning *Fundamentals*, what light haue we from these Fathers to try controuerxies now in Agitation, when they grant that Popery is made vp of the Fathers Errors? The final sentence is past, the iust Censure already giuen. The Fathers were, as we are now, plain Papists. I easily grant all.

*Recourse to  
Fathers in  
Fundamen-  
tals most in-  
significant.*

4. Shall I yet say more concerning the trial of Protestants Opinions, or the supposed errors of Catholicks by Fathers, and tell you? Sectaries haue no Gusto to it at all. And because it mainly import's first, to discouer their want of Euidence and next their fallacious proceeding in this particular, I will briefly do both and remit all here noted to the prudent Censure of euery Iudicious Reader. Thus it is. There is not one controuerxy now disputed, in which our Protestants do so much as offer to plead by a General Consent of Fathers, (and Mr Scillingf: likes not to be sob'd off with Two or three Testimonies) Read their writings of the Real presence of Prayers for the Dead, Invocation of Saints, of a Sacrifice upon the Altar, of the infallibility of the Church, and tell me

*Protestants  
never offer  
to plead by  
a General  
Consent of  
Fathers,*

156 Disc. 1. C. 15. *Other Principles insufficient*

after you have perused all, How many Fathers you find clear and expresse for Protestancy? A sight of *four* or *five* would help much, But hereof there is no danger, for you have not one clear and expresse (I say more, not one so much as probable) against the *fallibility* of the Roman Catholick Church, Against praying for the Dead &c. And therefore wonder not that Mr Stilling: Part. 3. C. 6. P. 641. where he treat's of Purgatory, talk's much of the Fathers Fancies and Imaginations; And of an itching Curiosity some have to know more concerning the future state of souls, than God has revealed, But after all produceth not one Testimony either clear or probable against our Catholick Doctrine.

5. Do you desire to see more of this want in behalf of Protestancy, And how little there is to countenance the Newly Turn again, to Mr Stilling: Part. 2. C. 1. P. 293. Where you find a Title threatening ruin to vs all. *The Roman Church, not the Catholick Church.* Say, I beseech you, who would not have expected after such a clap of Thunder, a whole Torrent of Fathers to have followed for his purpose? But in lieu of these what have we? Marry, He tell's vs First. His Bishop makes a great deal of difference between *The Church*, And *A Church*, and some difference also between a *True Church* and a *right Church*, next he fall's foul on his Aduersary, for his not well considering what the Primate had said: Lastly (to pass by a few iears) he speak's much of the Vniuersal spreading of the Churches Doctrine and Vnity thereof, which is due to the Roman Catholick Church only, But after his long Discourse and the rapping Title with it, you have neither sentence nor syllable of any Father, which so much as meanly insinuates, That, that ancient Moral body (as it comprehend's all Christians vnited in one Belief) is not the only True and Orthodox Church in the world: Yet here had been a most fit place to have pleaded by plain expresse Authorities (I mean such as directly proue the Roman not to be the Catholick Church) Belieue it, were there any such in the Fathers Volumes, Mr Stilling: to make his margents glorious, would haue brought them to light with a witness, But of this main point

*Empty words  
given in  
lieu of  
Fathers,*

point he is utterly silent, because he had nothing to say, And therefore wisely Slip's aside to other *By-Matters*, and leaues his Title to shift for it self.

8. Hence you may well conclude that our Sectaries are driven into strange Straits, when we vrge them to proue their Protestancy. We first call them to plain Scripture for a Final decision in this particular, but wanting where with all, they sit vs right with a return of Antiscriptural glosses. We press them again to name any orthodox Church, which fīue or Six ages since professed their *Novelties*: Nor a word is Answered. We make Inquiry after Councils held by Protestants before Luther, for the Protestant Religion. Silence, deep Silence, not one is found. Mention only Oral Tradition; they storm at you, because they know Protestancy has none. We appeal to the authority of the most ancient Fathers, you see how we are serued, with *Words* and *empty Titles*. Nothing is or can be alleged clear, Nothing expres, Nothing probable. Finally, to leaue them without all excuse. We call them again to an account, and Ask whether they will haue their cause tryed and iudged by their own Doctors, *Luther, Calvin, Zuingliu* and the like? No satisfaction is found here. Luther condemn's Calvin more violently, than the Prelatick Party in England doth the Quakers, and Send's the Associates of Calvin to Hell, for denying the *Real presence* of Christs body in the Sacrament, And Calvin is as fierce against Luther in this particular. And thus all Sectaries haue opposed one another from the very beginning of this woful Reformation. Some plead for our Catholick Doctrin, Others are contrary as you may read at large, almost in euery Page of the *Protestants Apology*. We therefore know not what these Nouellists would or can belieue, whilst these endles differences about Belief thus turn their heads, and make them to belieue iust nothing, but what euery fancy pleaseth. What a Religion haue we here? View well it's exterior, you haue only Horrour and confusion to look on. *Altars pulled down, Cloisters demolished, Monks places prophaned, Stately Churches turned into Slutish barns,*

*Of these Straits  
the Sectaries  
are Cast  
into.*

*Protestants  
irreconcilably  
Contradict  
Protestants.*

178 Disc. I. C. 15. *Other Principles insufficient*

*Neither In-  
terious nor  
exterior  
valuable in  
protestancy.*

by a barbarous Reformation. Enter into the Interior, or call-  
serious thought on that which should essentially constitute Reli-  
gion, you find *this* Protestancy a meer new Nothing, as Scrip-  
turre lesse as Churchiles, without Tradition, without the consent  
of Fathers, or any Christian Principle to uphold it, yea (as  
this utterly ruin's all) without any Agreement in Doctrin amongst  
themselues. May we not Therefore iustly deplore the sad con-  
dition of Thousands now within our once most Catholick En-  
gland, to see a *Thing* which stand's on no Principles but false,  
most earnestly stood for, by men of excellent natural parts, and  
these English too, whose Progenitors (the world knowes it full)  
as wise as They) were all Roman Catholicks? But what will yet  
Good Reuenues, A merry life, a handsome wife, and self-will  
will haue it so. And thus much of the want of clear Authori-  
ties in behalf of Protestants.

*Solaries  
proceed  
unworthily  
with the  
Fathers.*

7. We are now to speak a word of their fallacious, or  
rather open iniurious Proceeding with the Fathers. And to make  
good what I am about to Say, you may please to resort  
vpon the Notes in the other Treatise, Chiefly. Disc. 4. C. 1.  
23. 24. Where you are told That the great work of Pro-  
testants, is not so much to proue Their own Religion, as to  
spend time in cauilling at ours, And by superficial Glosses  
drive sense out of the Fathers most significant Doctrin, as  
then to tell the world, they are not for Popery. And (tho  
(may their glosses haue place) no Religion (neither their nor  
ours) can be proued by the Fathers. This most unworthy  
Procedyre with these, great Lights of the Church lengtheneth  
Protestants books, And makes Mr Stillingsmeers Account to  
swell into the bulk you see. Might I here (by the way)  
speak my thoughts concerning it; I verily belieue there was  
neuer Book set forth, which lesse deserved it's Tide, than  
this. He call's it: *A Rational Account of the grounds of Pro-  
testant Religion*, yet if any one, after a diligent perusal of the whole  
Work, can show me but one Article of Protestancy proued  
by plain Scripture, by a General consent of Fathers, by any  
ancient

ancient Church Doctrin, or vniuersal Tradition, I do at this present engage, to euince by my Answer, That he is grossly mistaken. The fairest Occasion Mr Stillingfleet had to speak home for Protestancy, was. Part. 1. C. 7. Where he treat's of their way of resolving Faith, yet euen here he fall's so utterly from the Cause, that he saies no more for Protestancy, than *Arianism*. See the other Treatise. Disc. 1. C. 9. You will ask perhaps wherein then lies the Substance of his book? I Answer in two things chiefly. First in a tedious wordy quarrel with Catholick Religion; (His flurting at it is endlesse) 2. In a gross Abuse of the Fathers by his intolerable Glosses. Of neither shall he giue a rational Account to God at the day of Iudgement. To proue what is here hinted at, Read I beseech you the following Chapter, which I place here on set purpose to lead in a further discourse concerning the Glosses of Sectaries, Withall to lay forth their emptiness and fraud; And finally to show whether these Vnprincipled, life-less, Whimsies, end at last. Thus much performed, you shall see Protestancy appear like it self, a meer Nothing.

Two imper-  
tinencies  
Constitute  
the subst-  
ance of Mr  
Stilling's  
Account.

## CHAP. XVI.

One word more of Mr Stillingfleets Glosses, and  
his vnexusable abuse of other Fathers.

THOUGH much is said of this subject already, yet be-  
cause here is Occasion again, I shall briefly paint at  
two or three of Mr Stillingfleets notorious Abuses. To profe-  
cure all or the half he has, would make this Treatise as big as  
his volume. We begin with that knowne Passage of S. Hierome  
Epist. 57. Ad Damasum, where the Saint saith. The Church is  
built upon S. Peters See, and whosoever is out of the Communion of  
the Church (whereof Pope Damasus was then head) is *Brutus*, an  
Alien,



S. Hierome  
abused.

*Alien, and belongs to Antichrist &c.* This in brief is the Substance of S. Hierome's Doctrine. Mr Stilling: Part 2. C. 1. P. 311. Imputes not plainly these Expressions to *heat or flattery*, although saith he, it look's the more suspicious, because at that time S. Hierome had a great pique against the Eastern Bishops, And then tell's us to no purpose, what occasioned the Quarrel: Reflect good Reader. Is this hansom, to make a Saint and most profound Doctor to Speak in so weighty a Matter against Truth, and his own conscience, moued therunto by flattery and no man knows what Imagined Piques? Suppose he earnestly stood for Truth against those Bishops, must He Therefore be thought either to flatter or to deny truth now, when he writ's to a Pope, his lawful Superior? Vpon what Principle doth this vngrounded calumny Stand? Pray you Answer.

2. After some Parergons, not worth the mentioning. Mr Stilling: Saies. When S. Hierome Pronounces those Aliens and Prophets, who are out of the Communion of the Church, it either belongs not to the particular Church of Rome, or if it doth, it makes not to our purpose. What mean these words, The particular Church of Rome? The sole Diocess of that City? No. S. Hierome speak's of the Church built vpon S. Peter, or of all Churches vnited in Faith with that See, where Damafus then sate, which only (excluding Aliens, That is all heretical Societies) make vp the true Vniuersal Orthodox Church, as shall be demonstrated hereafter. Well saith Mr Stilling: Suppose I grant that S. Hierome spoke of the particular Church of Rome (he means, or t'is Nonne, of all Churches of the same Faith with the Roman) yet this comes not home to the purpose, vnless we Catholicks proue our Church to be as Orthodox now, as She was in those Primitive times. We proue, Good Sr. Proue you on God's name, whom prouing belong's, That this Church is less Orthodox now, than formerly. Who euer stand's in a known old path as we Do, ought not to proue he stand's there, (*Olim possides prior possideris* is his proof) but one that start's aside, and takes to a new way (as you haue done) should tell vs, why he left the other high

Mr Stilling:  
demand  
impertinent.

ask wherein his Ancestors walked? No prince proues his Right and Title to a Rebel, but if any be so vngracious as to rebel, that man must show why he did so, or suffer for it. But of this subject so much is said in the other Treatise that I hold it vnanswerable, More shall be added in its due place. In the mean while you see à pretty way of arguing, which run's vpon an idle Supposition: viz. That the Roman Church is altered from it self, since S. Hieroms time. The improbable Supposition is first to be proued, before the Argument haue any force, till then we may lawfully iudge, that S. Hierom's Testimony concludes against this Adversary. Pray tell me, If I, vpon à bare Supposition, should assert that Mr Stilling: is no good Diuine, and thence infer, he is unfit to write Controuersies, might he not most iustly be angry, and well deny my Assertion, because the Supposition whereon the Assertion stand's is not proued? No more, say is it proued in the present Matter. viz. *That our Church Doctrin is altered from it self since the primitive times.* Proue that vpon sound Principles, and you will doe more then Euer Protestant did hitherto.

*This false supposition not proued.*

3. Hence all Mr Stilling: following talk of Paralogisms fall's to nothing. It is he saith, our perpetual *Paralogism*, when the Fathers are cited in praise of the Church of Róme *although sometimes their Rhetorick swell'd too high in their Encomiasticks*, (They are his words) That we will needs haue these praises to be vnderstood as well of that Church in our present age, as in the Fathers time when it better deserved them; And he add's. *Although, it were not possible for à Church to be eminent for purity of Doctrin in one age, and to decline from it in another.* Answer. All this is worse than à Paralogism or any captious way of reasoning, for it tend's to nothing unless the main Supposition be proued, *to wit*, That the Roman Apostolical Catholick Church, once certainly pure in Doctrin has or Can decline from her Purity in after ages. Mr Stilling: knowes well that Catholics, who hold their Church infallible, make the receding from its Purity à thing impossible. How senseless then is it in this place, where that Question of Infallibility is not handled, first to suppose our Church fallen off from

its

Stillings  
Supposed  
which  
should be  
Proued,

its old Doctrin, and then to tell vs the Fathers *Encomiums* have nothing to do with it in this present state? I argue this, and Mr Stilling: P. 314. seem's to approue it. Vpon the Supposition that the Roman Catholick Church has not swerued nor can swerue from it's first pure Doctrin, The Fathers *Elogiums* are in this age as due to it, as in any other. But the Supposition must stand firmly built, as you shall see hereafter, vpon sure grounds and Principles. But contrariwise this way of arguing is Non-sense? I'll suppose vpon no grounds, the Roman Catholick Church to haue erred, and then I'll do an open iniustice and deny it the due Commendations giuen by the Fathers. It is iust as if one should say. I'll suppose à man hitherto reputed honest, to be à thief and then I'll deny him iustice, and hang him vp.

No other  
Church  
Catholick  
but the  
Roman,

4. I say vpon no Grounds. And to proue my Assertion, ask? With what Church then visible in the world were Christians obliged to Communicate, when all see S. Hierome will haue them to Communicate with some Church? Mr Stilling: Answers with the Catholick Church. Very Good. I Ask again, whether the Roman Church, and all other Churches vnited in Faith with it, were rightly called the true *Catholick Church*? Grant this you yield the cause, And Confess that Christians were then obliged to be in vnion with the *Roman Catholick Church*. Contrariwise, if you deny that to haue been *then the true Church*, you are cast vpon endless difficulties, and here is one which cannot be solued. Vpon the denial you, Sr, are obliged to denote, or name an other Catholick Church distinct from the Roman, more pure in Doctrin at that time, than She was, And that not only the Roman, but all others were Aliens and Prophane *who eate not the Lamb* or communicated not in faith, with your new found fancied Church in the aire. I say fancied, for to point at such à Church on earth is as impossible, as to proue known condemned Hereticks to be good Catholicks, whereof see more in the other Treatise. Bli.

3. C. 1.

5. Mr Stilling. to shift off the difficulty will perhaps say, When S. Hierome wrote This, The Roman Church was truly  
Ortho

Orthodox, and that He accounted all *Aliens* and *Prophane* who communicated not with it. Most true Doctrin: But see what followes. Be pleased to fall lower to the third or fourth Age after *S. Hierome*, There was then, I hope, à Catholick Church in the world, wherwith Christians Communicated in Faith; but most evidently there was not any *Then* reputed Orthodox, if we exclude the Roman from being so, For all other Societies *namable*, though called Christians were professed Hereticks; With these no man was obliged to communicate, Therefore all were either bound to Communicate with the Roman Catholick Church, or with no Church at all. Hence I infer that the Fathers *Eclogium's* giuen to the Roman Catholick Church were euer most iustly due, not once only, during the Primitiue times, but now also and in all Ages: Withall I assert, That Mr Stilling: denying this Truth, speak's his own fancy without proof, or the least appearance of any probable Principle. And he will be as wholly vnprincipled, if I first suppose (as I may if my Creed be true) That there is now at this very houre à true Catholick Church on earth, and should next demand, where that Church is, in whose vnion I must liue and dye? Will He pitch, think ye, vpon an vnion with the *Arians*, *Gracians*, *Abyssins* *Anabaptists* *Presbiterians* or *Quakers*? Light where he pleaseth, he can only vent his fancy without Proof or Principle. Now cast as it were this fancy into à ballance with those most weighty significant Testimonies of ancient Fathers, who positively press for communion with the Roman Catholick Church, and you will see à strange vneauen Parallel (conceited whinsyes, And strong reasonable Arguments, laid together). Yet wonder nothing, for weak fancy is the strongest Aduersary Catholick Religion hath

*In the ages  
after S. Hierome,  
no Church  
Orthodox  
but the  
Roman.*

*S. Cyprian's  
Testimony  
proposed,*

6. You haue yet an other Authority grossly misused by Mr Seilling: Page 315. And 'tis à known Passage of *S. Cyprian* in his 55. Epistle to *Cornelius*, where he complain's of certain factious Schismaticks, *who dared to sail to the chair of S. Peter, and the Principal Church from whence Priestly unity had its Origen, and carry letters*

*from*

from Prophane and Schismatical persons. *Nec cogitare eos esse Romanos* &c. not thinking them to be the Romans (whose Faith the Apostle commended) *ad quos perfidia habere non possit accessum*, to whom falshood, vprtruch, vnfaithfulness, cannot haue Access. Thus S. Cyprian And I put much force in those words. *Eos esse Romanos*. Those who then liued to be the Romans, prophetically commended by the Apostle, which words taken in an obuius sense argue, that true Faith should neuer part from the See of Rome. But Mr Scilling: conceal's this force, and translates. *Nos consideramus eos esse Romanos* &c. No less energy lies in the other following words. *To whom vnfaithfulness can haue no Access*, which seem to exclude à possibility of falshood from the Roman Church.

Vain Glosses  
Laid vpon  
The Testi-  
mony.

7. Now listen à little to four strange Glosses laid vpon this one Text. Three of them are the Bishops, and one Mr Scilling: laies claim to, The Bishops saies first. *Perfidia* can hardly stand here for error in Faith. And why not my Lord? He Answers. It properly signifies *malicious falshood* in matter of Trust, or in fact against the Discipline And gouernment of the Church. And I say, it as properly signifies *Vnfaithfulness*, or *Vntruch*. And therefore excludes error in Faith from the Romans; yea it must haue this sense here, because its opposed to the Faith of the Romans so much commended by the Apostle, which was true Christian Faith. *Perfidia* therefore signifies the quite contrary, that is error in Faith. But grant the sense to be as the Bishop glosseth, it excludes at least from the Romans to whom S. Cyprian wrote, à Possibility of doing any thing against the Discipline and Gouernment of the Church, or of being maliciously false in Matter of Trust. If this be so, much more are they secured by virtue of these words. (*Ad quos perfidia non possit habere accessum*) from à possibility of erring in Faith, for what auails it to haue à Church garded from vniust dealing in Matters of Trust, if you make it lyable to Error in the main Essential, which is true Faith, the very ground of Salvation, And Principle cause also of *ius proceeding* amongst Christians? Perhaps these men will say. S. Cyprian in his *Elogium* respected only the *fas*

Romani

Romans commended by the Apostle, not Those who lived in his time. Contra 1. That is not only said without Proof, but improbably falsifies the Saints express words. *Eos esse Romanos*, as is now noted. Contra. 2. If S. Cyprian only relate to the Romans whom the Apostle taught, what need is there to keep à coile about the signification of *Perfidia*; when those first Christians had for their Instructor an *Infallible Apostle*. If therefore S. Paul could not err in faith, *Perfidia*, may well exclude all misbelief or error in Matters of Faith from that Apostolical Church. And here we make way to discover the Bishops leuitie in his second Gloss.

*An other  
Gloss refused.*

8. Suppose saith he, it be granted that, *Perfidia*, Signifies error in faith, or Doctrine, yet it belongs not to the Romans absolutely, but with à respect to those first Romans, whose Faith was commended by the Apostle. Contra 1. Vpon what certain Principle doth this confident Assertion stand? *It belongs not absolutely to the Roman Church?* Proue thus much by à sure Principle, and something is said to the purpose. But without à solid Probation we look on it as à whimsie only, or à thought of fancy. Yet more. What mean's his Lordship by those dark words. *With à respect to those first Romans?* Will he say that the first Romans were infallible in Faith and make those others to whom S. Cyprian wrote, fallible? This must be his meaning or nothing, For if both were equally *infallible*, or both alike *fallible*, he gains nothing by the word, *Respect*, to the first Romans. Therefore he must hold that ancient Church of Rome to be more infallibly founded in Faith, than the later Romans were to whom S. Cyprian wrote; Admit this, He makes the Saint not only to flatter à whole Church, but to speak Nonsense also. For in effect he saith thus much. Your Ancestors the Romans, were so secured from error in Faith, that they could not decline from Christ's Doctrine, but you now are in à very tottering Condition, for you may swerue from the Faith of your Ancestors, you may perhaps belieue as they did, and perhaps not, How-  
uer I will *seeth* you vp and praise you, as à Church impossi-

*A second  
and third  
Gloss re-  
fused.*



ble to erre with, an *Ad quos Perfidia habere non possit accessum*. You are men so faithfull that no Misbelief can touch you. The last Gloss of the Bishop is thus. *S. Cyprians Elogium* seem's rather à *Rhetorical insinuation*, than à Dogmatical Assertion. Mark the proofles word, *Seem's*, 't's only à thought of my Lords fancy, which I am sure seem's far from à dogmatical Assertion. What? That à Saint and worthy Bishop should *Rhetorick* it in so weighty à Matter? But enough of this nothing.

Mr Stilling:  
misinterpretation.

9. To make something doe at last, Mr Stilling: Page. 317. laies his Gloss by my Lord's, and has à good opinion of it. To giue every man his due, it is better than any of the Bishops. He sayes in à word, (after à relation of the present state of Rome at that time, when those Schismatics, *Felicismus* and *Fortunatus* came thither) that, *Perfidia*, may well denote the Fainnes and treacherous dealing of those two Persons, who seemed good Catholicks, but were not so, and sought to ioyne in Communion with *Cornelius* and the Catholick Party, but meant it not. Now such Iuglers should haue no Access to the *Principal Church*, or to those Romans, whose Faith the Apostle is highly extolled, so that *Perfidia* Respects not the Romans, nor excludes Errorr from that Church, but laies falshood (as was well deserued) on those *Schismatics*. This I take to be Mr Stilling: meaning. Contra. 1. The Gloss, euery one sees, violently strained, makes the allusion between *Fides* and *Perfidia*, insignificant. 2. It is inconsistent with the Authors whole sense, who speak's (not of perfidious men but) of Falshood and Vntruth, which could not haue Access to that principal Church. For it is euidnt, that perfidious persons, as Mr Stilling: tell's the Story, actually had Access, And therefore could certainly haue it, when *Fortunatus* and *Felicismus* came to Rome. 3. Make the most you can of this Gloss it reaches no further bnt to à meer far-fetcht *Guess*, and what is gained by That? Can Mr Stilling: establish his Opinion of the Churches fallibility on no surer grounds? Can he hope to strike me by guesses and Glosses, not only from the Obuious

Both Strained  
and  
inconsistent  
with S. Cyprians sense.

of these words, but also from the clear Expressions of innumerable other Fathers who stand openly for an infallible Church? It is à desperate Improbability. Yet so it is: These selfconceited Glosses and nothing els, Uphold Protestantcy in every controuerted Matter. The infinite number of them, and the Stories Mr Stilling: tell's to no purpose at all, so enlarge his *Rational account*, That if you sling these away, you may easily put the remainder of that Book, into à final *Decimo-sexto*.

10. Be pleased to obserue à little. We say, and Christ said it before vs, *Hell gates should not preuaile against the Church* founded by Diuine Providence, But fancied Glosses disputes it at last into à Possibility of being peruerted by Hell, and Heresy also. We say, it is *the Pillar and ground of Truth*, but Glosses laid vpon these words must be thought so strong as to shake it all in pieces. We say, *Christ will be with his Spouse* to the end of the world. Hold there, say Sectaries, our Glosses tell you, *No*, For this promise was only *Conditionally True*, in all that succeeded the Apostles. A fitting Assistance we allow it, such as pleases our fancies, But no more. We say with S. Cyprian S. Hierome, S. Irenaeus and other Fathers, that the Church *neuer departs from what She once held*; that in Her is *the Rule and square of Faith*; that in Her, is *the spirit of God*, That *she is the wellspring of truth*, *The dwelling place of Faith* &c. But à companie of Glosses spoil all this Doctrin, And so rack the sense of these clear Expressions, that one may boldly swear, the Gloss and Text are sworn enemies.

*Gl: ges oppos:  
sed to mani-  
fest Proofs.*

## CHAP. XVII.

*VVhy the Glosses of Sectaries are impertinent and weightles? Mr Stillingfleet misinterprets other Fathers.  
Of his vnskillful Speculation concerning  
Idolatry Charged on Catholicks.*

*An assertion  
clearly laid  
forth.*

*How Secta-  
ries proceed  
so weakly in it.*

1. **M**uch is said in the Other Treatise. Disc. 4. C. 4. n. 8. of our Protestants Glosses, Here you haue a further discovery of their weakness, And 'tis the only thing aynd at in this, And the precedent Chapters. In a word thus conclude. That man who in Matters of Controuerfies defend's a Doctrin vpon no furer grounds then meer doubtful And uncertain Glosses are, added to Scripture and the Fathers, (which seem contrary to his Doctrin) most evidently stand's vnproo'd, proceed's weakly, and proues nothing. But the Protestant makes his weak, and doubtful Glosses, charged on such Authorities as are produced for our Catholick Texts, as his support, the only Proof of his contrary Doctrin, Therefore He proceed's vnreasonably, and proues nothing. You shall see this evidenced in the present Matter now briefly hinted at, of the Infallibility of the Roman Catholick Church. Mr Stilling: Asserts, *She is fallible.* I ask how He proues the Assertion? What? By expresse Scripture, vniuersal Tradition, the vnanimous Consent of Fathers, the Definitions of any ancient Church or Council? These are excellent Principles: Could He send his opinion vpon all, or vpon any one of them we haue done and must yeild. But he proceed's strangely, and I must needs tell you How. The man hopes to weaken our proofs draw from the Fathers in behalfe of the Churches infallibility, And thereby to establish his Position. *She is fallible.* I demand, how

can our Proofs be weakened? His Answer must be (for he has no other) I will so tamper with these your alleged *Texts* that at last I'll make them prove nothing for your Churches Infallibility, And consequently I may hold my Contrary *Possition* (of her Fallibility) very well established. The inference is worth nothing, but let it pass. I Ask. 3. What is it he will tamper withall, or how can he make null those manifest *Texts* which clearly lye open to every eye cast on the Fathers, And evince, (as we shall see hereafter) that the Church is infallible? Mr Seillingfleets strain through his whole book (For, *Falsa loquuntur*) return's the best Answer. My Guesles (saith he) And Glosses laid on the Fathers, when seemingly contrary to Protestant Doctrine Shall make them speak another language, no way favouring the Churches infallibility.

2. Here we come to the point, And demand in the last place. Whether these Glosses are so clearly their Own *Selfe-Evidence*, that by their very light they lay a Truth before an understanding not to be contradicted. For example. Whether *S. Cyprian* in the Passage now cited, gave only, as Mr Seilling: saith, a taste of his old office of a *Rhetorician*, And spake not dogmatically? Is this I say an undeniable Truth? Most evidently no. For stretch it to the furthest it can be no more but a most doubtful and uncertain Gloss, I say 'tis highly improbable. Now be pleased to reflect. The Assertion concerning the Churches fallibility is no Self-evidenced Truth nor clear *Ex terminis* (no more is our contrary Doctrine of the Churches infallibility) To give it Therefore proof and weight, these Glosses are cast vpon the Fathers, who seemingly at least favour infallibility; But these very Glosses which should do that service are as unevident, as uncertain, and doubtful as the very Doctrine is, They should enlighten and lend proof to, Ergo they advance not at all the Doctrine concerning the Churches fallibility. For, proofs which are as uncertain as the very Doctrine is which should be proved, can neuer raise that to a greater measure of certainty than it had before such proofs were thought of. Please to mark what I say. The Doctrine of the Churches

*Their Glosses  
has no selfe  
Evidence.*

Y

fallibility

*The force of  
our Argu-  
ment more  
significantly  
expressed.*

fallibility here supposed by Sectaries is vncertain, and for that reason lies in it's *vnevidence*, until solid Proofs clear it, or expel both the vnevidence and vncertainty, But these Glosses when they appear, are as vnevident and vncertain as the Doctrin is, Therefore they cannot raise the Doctrin to any higher degree of certainty, than to mger *vnevidence* and *vncertainty*: I would have this noted, For it is a ground whereby I shal show hereafter Protestantcy to be a most improbable Religion, And Therefore will deliuer it once more in these plainer Terms. If the Sectary haue no surer Principle whereon to found his yet vnevidenced opinion, of the Churches fallibility then Doubtful Glosses laid on Scripture and Fathers, (as evidently he has not) And These Glosses which should proue that Doctrin be as deuoid of strength as remote from Principles, as vncertain, or doubtful, as that yet vnevidenced Doctrin is; It followes clearly, That both the Doctrin and the Glosses fall to nothing but only subsist by fancy, which is a real Truth. From all now said I infer, that whoeuer interprets, must haue his Doctrin firmly grounded vpon certain Principles distinct from his own interpretations (as the Catholick euer hath) or nothing is proued.

*Our Adversaries reply  
refuted.*

3. Mr Stilling may reply, His intention whilst he interprets these Fathers is not to proue immediatly his own Opinion of the Churches fallibility, but only to show our alleged Testimonies come not home, or want force to proue Her infallible. Now to shew our proofs forceles in order to what we hold, is not to make good his contrary Assertion: For these two things are very different; To make null our proofs, and to establish his own Doctrin. Answ. I grant they are different. But neither is, nor can be done. Nor the first. Because these Glosses are no *Self-evident* prouing, That the Fathers sense is rightly hit on: And Principles distinct from these Glosses, whereby it may be shown what Doctrin the Fathers deliuered in this particular, Mr Stilling hath not any so much as meanly probable. To the second I Answer: If He offer's not to proue his Tenet of the Churches fallibility by the little strength these glosses haue, I auouch it holdly, All fur-

ther Probations fail him, and for that reason he is either forced to make use of such poor stuff to proue withall or must sit down silent, And grant his Tenet cannot be proued. He may perhaps tell vs our Church has erred de facto, Ergo it is fallible: And here is his Principle. I Answer its no Principle to me, but an Heresy, And as Asserted by him 'tis as much, yea more, doubtful than all his glosses are laid together. He may reply. 3. His Glosses may at least be thought probable. I utterly deny that, And here is my ground. Solely considered they euidence not their own probability, But need further proof and probable Principles to rely on; But such proofs are wanting to found Probability vpon, Therefore these glosses are *supposed only*, not *proued probable*. Had Mr Stilling: plain Scripture, any Orthodox Church, or Fathers clear for the Doctrin maintained by him, He might well talk of the strength Of his Glosses, but to make Glosses probable, when no probable ground supports the Doctrin, for *whose sake* he Glosses, is not only lost labour, but share's much of Non-sense. Again. Were these Glosses probable, (which I shall neuer grant) our Answers to them are at least as probable, And what gain's either Party to their cause by skirmishing in the dark with weak Probabilities only? Matters of Religion, which must stand vpon sure Principles (or there is no such thing as Religion in the world) would be iust like weak Opinions in schools Tenable or not tenable as different iudgements please to Opine, might. Topicks, And probabilities only, tway in so weighty a Cause.

*The Sectaries Glosses not so much as Probable.*

4. Vpon this ground you haue Euidence enough, against these pretended Probabilities of Sectaries (whereof more presently) Be pleased to obserue it. The Catholick faith. The *Roman Catholick Church is infallible*. No, saith the Protestant, *she is fallible*. Here lies the contradiction. If both these Aduersaries Assert so boldly, each of them (supposing that God hath revealed the one or other part of the Contradiction) must solidly proue what he Assert's in so weighty a Matter. And can any man perswade himself, that an Infinite wisdom hath laid That Truth whereon so much depend's and is now revealed to Christians



The obvious  
truths of  
Christianity  
not proved  
by Guesse.

rians (whether it be the Churches fallibility or the contrary) in such Obscurity, or removed it so far from prudent Reason, That no man can find it out, or proue it, but by the dark glimpses of weak Guesse, of vncertain Topicks and Probabilities, which of their own nature easily throw men into error? Grant this much, We first do injury to Gods Reuelation. Next we are left in suspence, And know not what to belieue. And here I ask whether Mr Stillingfleet will oblige me vnder pain of damnation stedfastly to belieue the absolute fallibility of the Roman Catholick Church? If he doth, no weaker Principle then plain Scripture can be my Security, And this I require of him. If he recoyle and produce not plain Scripture, He is more than imprudent, to force on me a new Faith contrary to the iudgement of a whole Church, ypon no stronger proofs than weak guesse are. Lastly, may Topicks auail here, we lay an impossible obligation on our selues whilst all must say, God will haue vs to belieue and with all certainty what he hath reuealed in this particular; Yet when we come to examin the Grounds and Proofs of our certain belief, All Proofs vanish away into Topicks and vncertain fancies. Hence I conclude, if the Protestants affirm's, as he doth, that our Church is fallible, He must proue the Assertion by indubitable Principles, And the like obligation lies on the Catholick, who saith: *She is infallible*; And this by the grace of God shall be proped in the next Discourse.

Proofs of  
Christianity  
are weak Topicks.

5. In the interim if you desire to see more of much injury done to the ancient Fathers, turn only to Mr Stilling: 3. Part. C. 4. P. 58. Where he oppugn's our Catholick Doctrin of praying to Saints, And you may well stand astonished at his Vnprincipled Glosses. He saith first, The Expressions of Fathers which seem most to countenance this Inuocation, are only *stupid flourishes*. Has the Assertion any probability think you? Read only the Testimonies alleged by Cardinal B. *Bernin de Sand: Bratitudine*. Cap. 19. By Cardinal Perron (large vpon this subject) And Cardinal Richelieu. *Traicté pour conuertir ceux qui se sont separés de L'Eglise*. Lib. 3. Chiefly Page 420. (It is not now my intent to

trans-

transcribe those many vnanswerable Authorities alleged in behalfe of our Doctrin: And if after the perusal you see not plainly that both Mr Stillingfleet and his Lord doe grossly abuse the Fathers, deny me credit hereafter.

6. To conuince the first: of vniust proceeding, I'll only instance in one particular. P. 589. Where he saith that S. Gregory *Nysin* in his commendation of S. Theodorus the martyr, made vse of Rhetorick in his *apostrophe* to the Saint, without any solemn Inuocation. It is vtterly vntrue. The words of S. Gregory are These. *Paris Prim.* 1615. Page 1011. And 1017. when the Scythians threatned ruin to the Countrey: *Pray for vs, make intercession to him who is our Common Lord and King, As you are a souldier fight for vs and defend vs, And as you are a martyr, speak freely for your fellow seruants,* A few lines after: *And if more Prayers be needful assemble together the whole Quire of your Brethren Martyrs, and ioynly intercede for vs.* Put S. Peter in mind, moue S. Paul and the beloued Disciple of our Lord, that They be sollicitous for the Churches, where they once were chained, passed dangers, and finally dyed. Iudge, good Reader, whether this recourse made to a Saint in time of danger be only a Rhetorical flourish, when the very words imply a most solemn and serious Inuocation: *Pray for vs, Make intercession. Let all the Martyrs ioynly become Petitioners in our behalf in these our necessities,* are no flourishes but holy and hearty Inuocations. Yet more. When all the Fathers in the Council of Calcedon. Act 11. Tom. 2. Concil Part. 11 P. 340. No less publicly, in the presence of the whole Council, than piously inuoked the Holy martyr Flavianus thus. *Flavianus post mortem vivit. Martyr pro nobis orat.* Flavianus liues after Death, let that Martyr Pray for vs. Can any one in Conscience thinke that this was only a Rhetorical flourish? Or that the learned Theodoret acted only a Rhetoricians part, when in his History of Saints He concludes euery life, as Bellarmine obserues, with an earnest Petition that by the holy intercession of these happy souls, now in Bliss, he might haue aide and diuine Assistance? S. Austin was a good Rhetorician, yet no man will say, he made vse of flourishes in

Mr Stillingfleet  
again abuses  
the  
Fathers,

Express for  
Inuocation.

*Doctrin at  
least Collected  
out of  
S. Augustin*

that plain and deuout prayer to our Blessed Lady. *Tom. 9. Mediat : C. 40. Holy and immaculate Virgin Mother of God, Mother of our Lord Iesw Christ vouchsafe to pray for me to him, Cuius mens efficit templum*, for whom you haue deserued to be made à worthy Temple: He mean's the Temple of her sacred body, wherein her only Son our Saniour, pleased to inhabit nine months together. A whole volume would be necessary to allege other Fathers in confirmation of our Catholick Doctrin. But these few manifestly proue that Mr Stillinge grossly erred, when he said, that the Expressions of Fathers which seem to Countenance the inuocation of Saints, look only like Blossoms, and pretty flourish in Rhetorick, Withall, that his second Assertion (viz. The Church did not then admit of the Inuocation of Saints, but only of the Commemoration of Martyrs) is no more but à dream, or à most improbable saying.

7. It is not now my intent, when I only touch à few, to tax Mr Stillinge of many other gross mistakes in this orre controuersy, whereof I verily think his own Conscience accuseth him (but leaue that to God). Howener, because contrary to his usual manner he enters vpon à preclusion, which I am confident he vnderstand's not, I will doe so much seruice as to ynbeguile both him and his Reader.

*Mr Stillinge :  
Speculation,  
Examined,*

8. Page 594. he saith. *I cannot possibly see but that kind of worship which was given by the Heathens to their Daemons, was bestowed vpon the same grounds that the Inuocation of Saints is now.* Here is all. Mr Stillinge see's not the difference: Ergo, *There is none.* Let that pass. Next *Augustus Caesar* is brought in for an Instance. *The Senate*, saith he, *decrees that Diuine honours shall be given to Augustus.* And *we cannot think that by virtue of this decree Augustus assumed à Diuine nature or, became absolutely God.* No indeed. For no decree of à Senate can make à Sinner either God, or Saint. But the Question is, what honour the Senate intended to giue that Roman Emperour? You say it was Diuine. What this Diuine honour was, decreed as due to him, neither you nor I, Sr, know too well, nor doth it much import vs to know at present.

Ent. Let that therefore pass also. We now come to the point. Suppose, say you, that some Roman Catholick should believe Augustus to have been a Saint: Next suppose the Heathen and Catholick to be at their prayers together to Augustus, you demand wherein lies so much difference, That the one is Idolatry and the other not. Here, Sr, its clear you vnderstand not your selfe, For its no more Idolatry to worship one as a saint that's none, then to reuerence one for a Father (or prince) who is not so. Idolatry is then committed when we either adore a creature as God, or appropriate some perfection to it which belongs to God. Should you therefore hold all Iohn Foxes (miscalled) Martyrs, Saints, And then invoke them, you would beyon that account a false and foolish worshiper, yet no Idolater, whilst you Reuerence them as faintly creatures only, And attribute no perfection to them which properly belongs to God: No more say I, would the Heathen and Catholick Commit Idolatry, though they reuerenced Augustus and prayed to him as a Saint.

9. This mistake discovered, I must tell you, Had you proposed the question more ingenuously, And told vs, whether the erring Catholick when he believes Augustus a Saint and prays to him is to be supposed mistaken by a Iudgement vincible or invincible erroneous (The like is of the Heathen) you had solved your own difficulty, And might well have Spared that after talk, which comes in Thus. Neither of them supposes Augustus to be the Supreme God, but the Catholick and Heathen look on him as having a middle kind of excellency between God and man, the external actions are the same in both and their apprehensions of his excellency being equal, the inclinations of their wills to resist their devotion must be equal too. Here is a two fold fallacy on foot again. One lies in those vnexpressed Terms. A middle kind of excellency. An other (and that's worse) in concealing the tendency of these supposed apprehensions, or Iudgements rather, which may be either vincibly or invincibly erroneous: And marke well the distinction for it discovers your whole mistake. Concerning the first. I ask, what that middle Excellency is, which must be equally applied to the apprehension

Full of mistakes.

prehension of the Heathen and the Catholick? Must both of them be supposed to err so grossly, as to own Augustus à Saint in Heauen as the Patriarchs and Apostles now are? Or must the Catholick only iudge so? This later cannot be vnless you make the Catholick most inuincibly ignorant. Howeuer, such an error is possible, For as à man by inuincible ignorance may iudge one to be à Prince who is not, in like manner He may be so inuincibly beguiled as to think *Augustus* à Saint who is not, And so may the Heathen (though it is very difficult) be deceived also. Vpon this Supposition of inuincible ignorance which you, Sr, neuer reflected on, I Answer. Neither the Heathen nor the Catholick doe, or can commit (we must Still vse your improper Phrase) *Formal* Idolatry, but *material* only, The reason is euident. For though *Augustus* be really no Saint, yet that middle kind of excellency now mentioned, is vpon the Supposition inuincibly apprehended by both as if He were one, And consequently the apprehensions had of *Cæsars* Sanctity, the inclinations of their *Wills* to Testify their deuotion to him, And external actions may be equal, yet one and the same in both, but without fear of any *formal* false Homage, because inuincible ignorance takes off that *formal* Crime, And thus far, if we speak of sinful Veneration, there is no difference between them. The instance now hinted at clears all.

10. One comes among vs from à strange Countrey nobly attended, demean's himself like à Prince, or some great Person, and though in real truth he is no more but à Counterfeit, yet He imployes his wit so well, dissembles so dexterously, That all inuincibly iudge him to be what he is not, à Person of honour: They apprehend à middle kind of excellence in him between à great Monarch and an ordinary man, Reuerence him accordingly by their external actions, and inclinations of their wills, and therefore commit (might one speak so) some kind of *Ciuit* *material* *Idolatry*, But are excused from the formal offence, because of their ignorance, which is both inculpable and inuincible. Thus the case is in our present Matter, whilst the *Ratio formalis* of the Heathen and the Catholicks Adoration is one and the same, that

Inuincible  
ignorance  
excuses all  
Crimes.

is, whilst Sanctity, or what els you will, is inuincibly apprehended in dead *Cæsar*, which is not.

11. Exclude then this case of inuincible ignorance, which though dissembled by you, laies open the whole chear, The rest of your discourse comes to nothing. Obserue it. You talk of à middle kind of Excellence apprehended in *Cæsar* between Diuine and Humane. You should haue said plainly First. What this excellence is as it stand's in the Apprehensions of à Heathen and Catholick? You will haue it. 2. To be some thing which neither belongs to the Supreme God nor to à meer mortal man, Therefore what euer you imagin, is no real Object in *Cæsar*, nor any Excellence due to him. Whence it followes that all these Apprehensions, or iudgements rather, (for apprehensions solely considered are neither true nor false) which attribute that middle Excellence to *Augustus* are false in themselves, because not conformable to their Object. Now further: If false in themselves, they are either *vincibly* and *culpably* false, and Therefore ought to be laid aside; Or *inuincibly* false, because the iudgement is inuincibly deluded. Suppose the first case of vincible error, what euer prayer or Adoration followes vpon that iudgement is both à formal and material Crime, because some kind of excellence is vnworthily giuen to *Augustus* which belong's not to him. If so; The Catholick and the Heathen continue in their Idolatry. Contrariwise, if you suppose these iudgements inuincibly erroneous, which can scarce haue place in the Catholick vnless he be strangely ignorant, what euer Adoration followes vpon them is only à material Offence without the Formal sin, as is now declared. Wherefore I verily think you, Sr, vnderstand not your selfe too well, when you first suppose the *Ratio formalis* of prayer or Adoration the same in the Catholick and Heathen, And then tell vs, we are not to enquire whether the Apprehension be true or false, but what the nature of that act of Religion is, which is consequent vpon such an apprehension.

How the  
worship  
may be  
sinful.

12. Sr, in case of inuincible ignorance, it little import's to inquire after the Truth or Falshood of the Apprehension, for neither

Z

the



the *one* nor *other* (because out of the reach of one erring inuincibly) has influence into any act of Religion, And therefore there can be no irreligious worship or formal sin grounded vpon such a iudgement, if that Supposition stand. All then which ought to be searched into though omitted by you is. How, or in what manner these misled iudgements tend vnto their Obiect? If blameably, because *vincible* they are sinful, if inuincible and not in mans power to mend, They cannot hurt any. In all other cases except this one of inuincible ignorance you must enquire whether the Apprehension or iudgement be true or false. Suppose then it be *vincibly* and culpably false, it is apt to beget *false worship*, And should be laid aside. Suppose it true: It only saies thus much. Dead *Augustus* was a wise and gallant Commander (Here is all that can be truly apprehended of him) But this iudgement, as it find's no excellence in that dead Prince deseruing prayer or religious Veneration, so it cannot incline the will to exhibit any religious duty to him.

*What is to  
be inquired.*

13. And here we come to enlighten you a little, because you say. *You see not*, but that kind of worship which was giuen by the Heathens to their *Demons*, was as defensible vpon the same grounds, as the Inuocation of Saints is *now*. Can you, Sir, Speak in earnest? What *Now*? in this present state, when mens iudgements are cleared of error and inuincible ignorance, can you find no difference? The difference is most palpable: For that Deity is not in being, The Saint really is in Heauen. The Heathen adores his *Dæmon* misled by a false improbable Opinion and Therefore commit's Idolatry, The Catholick worships a Saint, assured of the Truth by a iudgement most certain, And therefore what He adores is worthy Adoration, vnless you can Vsaint those who are in Heauen, or proue they deserue no Reuerence in that happy State. Finally, the Heathens iudgement, because vnreasonable, and against the light of nature, if it own's a Deity in *Cæles*, is culpably sinful, and ought to be laid down: The Catholicks Iudgement point blank contrary, ought not to be put away. Now, Sir, if you say. All the Heathens worship

*The difference  
between true  
and false  
worship.*

of their *Demons* or inferiour *Gods*, arose from invincible ignorance of their Excellence (which is more then you can proue or probably maintain) Here is yet the difference between them and Catholicks, that These are neither formal nor material false worshipers, The Heathens were at least materially so.

14. What followes in Mr Stillings is not like his speculation any choise Matter but vulgar only, refuted again and again. As. 1. That the Rites of Canonizing Saints Answer to the Rites of the ancient Emperours *Apotheosis*. 2. The Formal reason of Idolatry lay in offering vp those deuotions to that *which was not God, which only belong's to an Infinite Being*. Let the Expression passe. Catholicks, I am sure, offer vp no such deuotions to Saints as they doe to God, knowing well to distinguish by the internal Acts of their Will between the *Supreme Excellence* and all other power inferior to *that*. 3. Saith Mr Stillings: it is not possible to conceiue any Act which doth more express our sence of an *Infinite Excellence*, And the Profession of our subiection to it, than Inuocation doth. Pitiful. He should haue said, then such à particular Inuocation doth, tending to an *Infinite Majesty*: For we inuoke and call vpon men now liuing to Assist vs with their Prayers, And likewise Address our selues to the Saints in Heauen. Yet no man can gather from such deuotions any thing like an acknowledgement of an *Infinite Excellence* in men now liuing, or the Saints in Heauen. But enough of these weightles Arguments, to touch them is to refute them. And thus much of this, And the other former Digressions. Now we are to à prosecute further Two necessary points,

Adoration  
very diffi-  
cult.

## CHAP. XVIII.

*The Protestant after all his Glosses can not ascertain any, of true Religion. He would make Controuersies an endles work.*

1. **Y**OU haue been often told aboue, that Sectaries would fain make controuersies à long work, I must now giue you the vltimate reason Thereof, And withal proue it impossible to know in these mens Principles, what is à Christian Truth, and what not, Their Glosses and impropable way of Arguing laies all which can be said in darknes and obscurity.

*Principles  
supposed.*

2. To proceed clearly. I suppose first, that Christian Truths *as reuealed*, or Contained in Christs Doctrin are infallible, and stand firm vpon infallible Reuelation. I may here also suppose. 2. That either we Catholicks, or our Protestant Aduersaries, even in such Tenets as we differ, Belieue and profess *Christian Truths*. For example. *Transubstantiation* or no *Transubstantiation*, is à Christian truth. *The Infallibility* of the Roman Catholick Church, or *Her fallibility* is à Christian Truth, for they are Contradictories held by Christians, Therefore the one or other must be owned true, if maintained as Christian Doctrin. I suppose. 3. That neither part of these Contradictions; *Transubstantiation*, or no *Transubstantiation* (in like manner we discourse of all other opposite Doctrins) are held their own *Self-evident* or manifestly true *Ex terminis* like the first Principles in nature, if Therefore assented to as Christian Truths by the one contrary Party, or the other; They must be proued by sure Principles extrinsecal to the Doctrin which each Party embraceth.

3. Now you shall see What work Sectaries make in these Disputable Matters, And how nothing can be certainly known by

by Them, or owned as à Christian verity. I would say, It Can neither be proued in their Principles, That to deny *Transubstantiation* (let this one instance serue for all) is à Truth, or, that to hold *Transubstantiation*, is an Errour. Here is my reason. When Principles whereon solid proofs should subsist are not, Proofs must of necessity fail, But in those Controuerted Matters Sectaries haue no Principles at all to Argue by, Therefore proofs must fail. The Mimor is euenced thus. All imaginable Principles whereon Proofs can stand in this contest, must either be infallible, or at least morally certain (Meer Probability want's strength to vphold à Christian Truth) But the Sectary cannot proue by any either *infallible* or *Moral* certain Principle, that his Tenet is à Christian Truth, And ours Contrary to him is an Errour, Ergo. The first part of my Assertion seem's euident. For you know what hauock the Sectary makes of all infallible Principles, Scripture only excepted, (which I am sure speak's not à word in his behalf, nor against vs). All Churches with him, All Tradition, All Councils, All Fathers also are fallible and may deceiue. Therefore thus much is indisputably clear, He cannot proue *infallibly* (I say no more yet) that his Tenets are Christian Truths; or infallibly, That ours contrary; are Errours, For no man can more deriue an infallible proof from à meer fallible Principle, than fetch gold out of dross or light out of Darknes. Whatever Therefore he plead's by next, is vnder the degree of infallible certainty. And what is it think ye? O, He has Moral Assurance (and here is the Principle) that his Tenets are Christian Truths, and Ours false or erroneous. Very good. I ask (Though moral certainty auail's nothings, as we shall see hereafter) How he proues no *Transubstantiation* to be à Doctrin morally certain, When the Contrary is exprefly defined in three General Councils, And held by à learned Church? Has he any Council so renowned, as either the *Latheran* or *Tridentine*, which euer owned his *Negative*, as à Christian Truth? Has he any Church as Vniuersally spread the whole whorl ouer as the Roman Catholick is, which maintained his Doctrin three or four Ages since?

An Assertion  
Proved.

Fallible  
Principles  
ground no  
infallible  
Doctrin.

Evidently No. Vpon what then, ground's He his Moral certainty? I'll tell you in a word. All he can pretend to, or plead in This Controversy comes to no more, if it reach so far, But to two or three dubious Authorities, taken from those Fathers who were *Professed members of the Roman Catholick Church*; And this little slender part He makes not only to strue against the whole Church, but moreouer giues it so much strength as to Impeach That great Moral body of errour, And vterly to ruin the Doctrin which hath been taught age after age; That is to say. The lesser Part, (or rather a meer supposed part) must be thought so powerful as to make a happy war Offensive and Defensive against that whole Moral body whereof it was a member. Is not this a strange Simplicity?

*A part  
Compared  
with the  
whole.*

4. Be pleased to take here one Instance from Ciuil affairs only. Suppose you haue a Parliament consisting of three hundred and three iust, vpright, graue and most intelligent Persons, who first treat of some weighty Matter relating to the good of a Kingdom or Common wealth, And after long deliberation Enact what in prudence is thought best in order to its Settlement. Suppose withall, that two or three of a different judgment withstand the Act, and hold what is concluded not well done. Will any one think ye, not only ascribe a greater moral Certainty to those three dissenting votes, Than to the other three hundred. But more ouer decri the far more numerous votes (though the Persons equally wise) as vniust, impertinent, and remote from the meanest degree of moral Certainty? And this is done, (read seriously) vpon no other ground, for no other reason, but because Three are wilfully supposed, by a third Party looking on you better, make vse of it. Imagin that a Synode Consisting of 303. Protestant Ministers define as they think, What's best to hold within the Compass of Protestant Religion: Imagine also that three oppose Them, Can any of that Religion ascribe more Moral certainty to the three votes, than to the other three hundred, if we respect Authority meerly? Certainly

*An Instance*

Our very case is here sufficiently expressed, and the instances easily applied to our present purpose. The Roman Catholick Church is, you know, a great Morall body comprehending not hundreds, but thousands and thousands, whereof innumerable are now and in past Ages haue been most iust, vpright, prudent, and without Controuersy most eminently learned. These vnanimously Enact-as it were (whether in the *Representative* of Councils, or by the vniuersal voice and vote of the whole Church,) That *Praying to Saints, prayers for the Dead*, or which we now insist on, the Doctrin of *Transubstantiation*, are not only Tenets *morally certain*, But more ouer *Articles of Diuine Faith*. Our Adversaries to oppose this vnquestionable certainty, produce three or four Authorities not clear (as is supposed done in Parliament) but weak and strained, and hope hereby to reuerse, to vnuote, what these thousands haue decreed contrary: Three or four witnesses, And these at most dubious, are here brought in against *Transubstantiation*, to make our new mens opinion Morally certain, and yet These thousands, most wise and learned, though they clearly vote and profess against it, cannot, forsooth, gain so much credit with a few Sectaries as to aduance the Doctrin to moral Certainty, For here we waue the question of infallible Assurance. What Doings are these? *What daies do we live in?* The whole Catholick Church teaches as She euer taught, that the very Substance of bread is really changed into Christs Sacred body, And now (o strange times) one Theoderet though no way opposit ishaled in, to reuerse the Doctrin. One, must strue against, and conquer Thousands. It is, we say, a pretty feat to kill two Birds with one bolt, But here we haue a greater exploit, *Theoderet* is supposed to leuel so right with a darker expressions (if yet dark:) That he destroys the Faith of two Churches at Once, the Greeck and Latin. Councils and eminent learned councils, haue defined in our behalf, and one *Tertullian*, Though herein he speak's most Catholickly, is pick't out to plead against them. What's one against innumerable? Tradition both Ancient and modern deliues the Truth we Pro-

*Applied to  
our present  
purpose*

*Authorities  
not clear  
imparti-  
nently al-  
leged.*

*A parallel of  
Authorities.*



with an  
Addition.

pugn, And an vnknown Gelasius, set vp by Sectaries, must be thought powerful enough to repeal and contradict our fore Fathers Tradition. What Doings are these? Can the Sectary hope to beate down that stronge *Fortress* which Hell gates could neuer shake by such slight and forceless Armour? Alas, goe to single votes, we oppose our *Iustins*, our *Cyrills*, our *Cyprians* our *Chrysostom*, clear and expresse against one *Theoderet* were he doubtful. Now adde to these The weight and graue Authority of our Church and Councils, There is no Parallel no Compariſon betwixt vs. Yet more. Suppose these few Authorities were clearly contrary to us, the Protestant only has at most three votes, as it were in Parliament against Millions, and what gain's he by this? His pretended Moral certainty stand's not firm like an vncontradicted Truth, against such à Cloud of opposit witnesses. And.

A further  
proof of our  
Assertion.

6. Here you haue à further reason of my Assertion. As long as this Principle stand's sure in nature. *A whole body is greater than à Part, and à Part thereof lesse extended than the whole.* So long it will be indisputably euident, That the vote or voice of à whole moral body (I mean of à Vniuersal Church far and neer extended) carries with it greater Moral certainty (For all this while we touch not vpon Infallibility) than à small and slender Part can haue, were such à part found so inuincibly ignorant as to contradict the whole. All I would say is. No more can à few particular members (Though Angels for knowledge) contest with the contrary iudgement of our ample Church, Than three votes in Parliament, with the Contrary iudgement of à whole Kingdom. No more can the Authority of particular men equalize, much less surmount in weight and worth, the Sentiment of à whole Moral body, than à hand, For example, surpass in bigness the whole man. As the one exceed's in quantity and *Extension*, so the other doth in weight and *Intension*.

7. Hence you see first. How poorly Sectaries play at final Game, when hauing no ancient Church of their own to resort to, They are faine to run for refuge to à *Few Fathers professed members of our Church*, And here like people picking Salads, gather vp some small fragments which now they clip, now mangle, now pervert,

now Gloss, now dress after their new fashion, And at last serue all fairly vp in the larger Margents of their little English Books. With these they flourish and vapour as if, forsooth, à small parcel were able to contrast with the far greater Moral body, or a few stolen gleaning (were all true they say) sufficient to Vnuote what euer this Oracle of Truth hath defined contrary. Leau of, I beseech you Gentlemen this Trifling, giue vs weight for weight, measure for measure, Please to plead by sound Principles or you lose the cause, Dodge not with vs, we deal nobly with you.

*The new  
mode of  
Scolars  
arguing.*

8. Wee giue you plain and expresse Scripture. *The Church is à Pillar and ground of Truth. She is founded vpon à Rock &c.* And you Scriptureless men, return vs your fancied Glosses. We quote innumerable Fathers most significant for our Catholick *Positions*, And you sob vs off with obscurities, with *Criticisms* and such simple stuff. We appeal to Tradition, you haue none. We, (And this mainly import's) show you à Church, à Visible and à most glorious Church, which time out of mind, Belieued as we belieue, And would gladly know where your *Orthodox Church* was, which four Centuries since approued or published your Nouelties, And you like men losing your way, go wandring about till at last you fall vpon Theoderet's Dialogues, And with one single Passage ill espied and worse applyed, hope to vndoe the whole Catholick cause. It is not one nor ten Theoderets, though they speak far more clearly than is done, That can preiudice our Doctrin, whilst you haue neither *Church* nor *Councils* for yours. These Principles we demand of you, but you haue them not. Therefore you are cast into an impossibility of writing Controversies hereafter, For the few Shreds of Fathers unluckily cut out by you are too slight, to obscure the greater *Lights* of our Christianity, of our *Church*, of our *Councils*, of our *Tradition* and *innumerable Fathers*. Belieue it, had the Fathers you Quote so much Strength, as you imagin, others would haue read them before your eyes were open, better Iudgements would haue weighed what force they had, before your *Luthers* and *Caluins* we-

*The cele-  
stials  
Plea-  
ding im-  
portant.*

re in Being. But That wiser world now gone to Eternity wanted such Cautels; And knew well, That what a *Twine* or a *Carin* fides may be right, And may be wrong, But what the Church of Christ Defines and teaches, cannot but be sound and Orthodox, if God speak's Truth. Here is the Principle whereon Christians securely relied in past Ages, before our later Sectaries troubled the world.

*Doubtful  
Authorities,  
of no weight  
at all.*

9. You see. 2. in what a pitifull case Sectaries are, when no more is alleged against our Catholick Doctrin (And rest assured They haue no more) but a few scattered Authorities now taken from one, now from another ancient Father. Therefore I discourse thus. The Authority is either expressly plain against (which I neuer yet saw in any Doctrinal Contest between the Catholick and Protestant) or Contrariwise, *doubtful*, and *ambiguous*. If doubtful; it decides nothing, nor can the Protestant though He Vow's it Clear, make it soe, whilst the learned Catholick auouches the Contrary, Hitherto both of them stand vpon Opinions and end nothing. Neither can the one or other yet absolutely Say by virtue of such a Passage only. *Your Doctrin is False, And mine is True*, For a Principle rationally apprehended dubious, determin's none to an absolute true iudgement, one way or other. Let vs therefore suppose contrary to Truth, That the Sectary produceth a Father indubitably clear against Catholick Doctrin. Thanks be to God These great lights of the Church are not so scarce with vs, But that we are able to confront that one Authority with the plain Testimonies of other Fathers far more numerous. And thus much I here engage to do, may it please Sectaries to come to a iust Tryal, and fully examin with me this one point of *Transubstantiation*, now hinted at: And if after the Contest we do not only match our Adversary, but quite outvie him with many more Testimonies fully as clear and clearer, We may then rationally ask what's one clear Authority worth? I say yet more. Though we falsely suppose these particular contrary Authorities to lie *even*, or *equal on both Sides*, I mean, as pregnant for the Sectary, as for the Catholick, yet I neither lose my cause,

nor he gain's his, Because neither of vs can absolutely say vpon Moral certainty, which Doctrin is a Christian Truth, And which not. For in this conflict of Authorities *Suppos'd equal*, both iudgements are left in suspense, The one saith I quote clear Authorities for my Tent: The other answers Hee doth so too, And Therefore hitherto stand so equally poised That neither may cry Victory: Neither can yet pretend to so much Moral certainty as excludes All reasonable doubting, because both Parties must doubt, whilst the Authorities of the one abate the force of the other. What then followes from the Fathers Testimonies were they thus equally diuided, That is, if as many clearly stood for the Negative of no *Transubstantiation*, And just as many clearly for the Contrary Positiue? I Answer, This followes, That we and Sectaries must of necessity, ~~(will be forced to)~~ either appeal to a third certain concluding Principle, or stand doubtfully opining (as is often done in Schools) without a final Decision. For, to Belieue any thing certainly as Catholicks believe, if that Principle be excluded, or, to know any thing yet morally certain, as Sectaries pretend to know, is utterly impossible, Because a Principle purely probable, is evidently too weak, either to Support any firm Belief, or to ground so much Moral certainty of a Christian Truth, as excludes a possibility of doubting.

what if  
authorities  
were equal  
on both si-  
des

what follo-  
wes upon  
arguing out  
of doubtful  
Principles.

so. You will Ask what then is there which may raise these two Aduersaries from that low degree of meer Opining to a higher degree of certainty? I shall fully Answer the Question in the next Discourse, Here I say in a word, No Principle can do this, But one only which the Sectary want's, And the Catholick has to rely on, which is the Tradition, the Voice and open declared *iudgement* of Christs Catholick Church here ou earth. This faithful Oracle raises vs from the supposed State of our guessing Probably, to the highest degree of not only Moral, but also of Infalible certainty, Though now we preiudice that against our Aduersaries. The Sectary Therefore who disdain's to learn of this Oracle what Christian Truths are, shall

neuer come to his Moral certainty, though the Supposition already made of Authorities equal stood in vigour. I beseech you, How desperate his Cause is now, How remote from all such certainty *De facto*, (whether he impugn's our Doctrin, or plead's for his own opinions) when he hath nothing to rely on, but only à few dark and dubious Passages of some ancient Fathers?

What the  
Sectary can  
Plead.

11. I say *dubious Passages*, for in Truth (if so much) they are no more, And Therefore though we haue hitherto supposed Authorities *evenly* laid on both sides (To Show that nothing help's the Sectary out of his labyrinth), yet now I must tell the Story as 'tis. All he has in this world to plead, comes only to à few misinterpreted Authorities, And with such poor Gleanings, *Churchless man as He is*, he thinks to Out-brave à whole Church, To despy Tradition, to vntense the Fathers, to rob vs of our right, And finally to throw vs out of the Possession of those ancient Christian Truths, which both we and our Ancestors haue professed age after age without Alteration. What think ye? Haue à few rack't and tortured Sentences (Add to them as many *Cavils*, as many *Criticisms* as you please) force enough to do such wonders? Can these gleanings, misinterpreted as you haue seen, better inform vs of the ancient Primitive Truth, than the General voice or vniuersal consent of à whole Church now in being? It is improbable. Grant therefore (which I do not) That we know not too well the sense of one *Tiberius*, or of à *Tertullian* &c. The Catholick cleares his Doctrin, And derives it from surer Principles. viz. From the voice and open declaration Iudgement of his Church; And most deservedly look's on the Sectaries attempt as highly improbable, who will needs know what Doctrin we are to hold now, or, was anciently held amongst Christians, by à Fathers Testimony, when the very sense is supposed doubtful, And lies in obscurity. That is. *He will know more than can be known, He will force light out of darkness, And draw the moral certainty of his Doctrin from meer doubtful Principles, which is impossible.* And thus these men proceed in all other Controversies,

On what  
Principle  
the Catho-  
lick Stand's.

verses, though Confessions, that a whole ample Church decries their Doctrine as false And the open abuse of Fathers also. O, saith the Sectary, I little regard what the Church decries. Ans. : And much less do I regard what you cry against it, When the whole strength of your Claimours vltimately resolved, comes to no more but to fancied Glosses, laid vpon ambiguous Authorities. What in God's name would you be at? What can you pretend or intend? Shall clamours, Think ye, and your few clouded Testimonies force me to leaue my ancient Faith, when I evidently know, That the Church I liue in, call's louder on me and more rationally command's me to Belieue as I doe? This audible known voice of Christ's Church dull's your clamours, infidely Ourweigh's your Glosses, your guesles, And the doubtful Sentiment of any priuate Father.

*The Church  
opposed to  
Sectaries  
Clamours.*

12. The Sectary may reply. I haue now supposed, without Proof, the Fathers abused by him, whereas, if the Supposition hold's, its only doubtful whether it be so or no. Answ : Thus much is only supposed doubtful, That neither of vs can learn by words precisely obscure; what Doctrine to embrace, or what to reiect, Before a surer Oracle speak's and decide, the Controuersy. Catholicks say this Oracle is the Church, The Protestant who has no Church to recurr to, stand's trifling with his obscure Passages, hoping at last to make something of nothing, to hammer out of dark sentences the Clear Moral certainty of his new Doctrine Though contrary to the whole Church, And thus He abuseth both Fathers and reason also, Because as I said iust now, *A doubtful Principle yeilds not so much certainty.* If He say 3. His quoted Authorities are sufficiently clear to ground the Moral certainty of his Doctrine against the Church, it is a desperate, improbable Speech, For Moral certainty (which should pass as an uncontradicted truth) most evidently loseth that force, when a whole Church manifestly *contradict's* it. But hereof enough is Said in the other Treatise. Disc. 1. C. 6. n. 3.

13. You will ask perhaps, What is to be done if we meet with a Father so clear and expresse against Church-Doctrine that he

A a 3

cannot



*A doubt proposed and solved.*

cannot possibly be brought to a Catholick sense. I Answer. Suppose thus much, which I think was never yet heard of in any Contest betwixt the Protestant and Catholick, I'll absolutely deny the Authority and adhere to Church-Doctrin; For, as the whole body is greater than a part, so the iudgement of a whole Church is the stronger Principle here, and ought in reason to regulate and bear sway, before the sentiment of any private man, who by weaknes or inaduency may slip aside into Errour. I say through *weaknes or incontinency*, for if he obstinately oppose the Church, He is no Father in that, But an Heretick.

*What Authorities can be quoted?*

14. Whoeter reflects well on what is noted already will see, I hope, How neer we are to an End of disputes with Protestants if the Contest arise from the Authority of Fathers. Here is the Ground of what I am to Say. All the Authorities which can be quoted in Points now Controuerted are either plain, or esteemed plain for Catholick Doctrin both by the learned of our Church, and Sectaries also, As is amply proued aboue: Or Controuerted, are at most supposed doubtful. I Assent it boldly, the Sectary has not one plain Testimony for him in this debated Matter of *Transubstantiation*. And if one or two were granted plain, nothing to contrast with a whole Church and innumerable other Fathers.

*How Sectaries Shift off Authorities.*

15. Hence I Discourse. In case Authorities be Clear for Catholick Doctrin, the Sectary opposes vs improbably, if he seek to establish his Nouelties vpon a Principle which plainly teaches what we teach, And quite ruin's his contrary Opinion. If the Authority be doubtful, I haue said enough already. That, that gives no *Moral certainty*, but leaves you where you were before in a state of doubting. Observe now. All you get from the Protestant when the Fathers plainly teach Catholick Doctrin, is either to deny the Authority, as the Elder, And perhaps other Protestants haue done, or, after Mr Stillingfleets new Method, to Gloss them. All you get when a passage seem's dubious, is to quibbe more out of it than it has. Whence it is, That you euer find the Sectaries Doctrin (when He tampers with a Text

*(seemingly)*

(seemingly doubtful) to overreach, or to go beyond the strength of his Quotation That is, He speak's plainly what he would have you believe, And the more plainly he speak's; the further he run's from his Authority, which Therefore check's his Boldness, And Tell's him. I say no such thing as you Teach. Take for example those words of Theoderet. The Mystical Symbols remain after Consecration &c. O, saith the Sectary the meaning is, the inward Substance of bread remain's. Hold, Sir, there; That's more then the words allow of. Mystical Symbols may as well, yea far better, signify the exterior Accidents, than the inward Substance of bread, Therefore you overreach the Text, And abuse your Author.

13. Thus much premised. We shall come to our last intended Demonstration And by the grace of God Evidences, How Controversies may be ended, Though indeed, the Sectaries intricate way of handling Matters, makes them seem to a vulgar Reader a work without end, For say I beseech you? What can be more slight or more remote from Reason, than after a long Profession and quiet Possession had of our Catholick Verities, To see a few Sectaries (late Strangers to Christianity) step in amongst us, And after so many Ages; strut vp and down in a corner of the world, As if They, forsooth By their bringing to light again nothing but a list of old *obsolete* worn-out Heresies, could now Asseure Papists, How much of their Doctrine is Orthodox, And How much not? And this (O strange Boldnes!) is done vpon no other Principle, than vpon a few misconstrued words of some few ancient Fathers, without alleging plain Scripture or the Authority of any Church, for this most vicious and strange Proceeding. What can be more slight than to follow the lesser Light (or rather no Light at all) And to prefer That before the *Lampare maior*, which hitherto has illuminated the whole world? What can be more slight than to stand guessing at the sense of Fathers, To Gloss their plainest Testimonies, when these guesses and Glosses are unprincipled and haue no more Support, than the fancy of him who makes them? You shall now see  
whither

The process  
of Sectaries,  
slight.

whither these Glosses tend, And an End put to Controversies.

## CHAP. XIX.

*The last designe of Sectaries Glosses, discountered. They end nothing. The clear way to end Controversies of Religion. A distinction between Authority and Principled Authority. Of the improbability of Protestancy.*

*What Sectaries aim at by their Glosses.*

1. **N**Ote. When Sectaries Gloss Scripture or Fathers dear to Catholick Religion, and after much tugging violently force some piece of their new Doctrin from Passages lesse dear. Their aim is to keep vs off from the last sound Principles of ending Controversies. Mr Stillingfleet, like one haunted with two contrary Spirits, has a rare Talent this way. Now He charms a darker Passage out of all obscurity, And makes it speak Protestancy, So he giveth light to Theoderets *Mystical Symbols*: Now He does the contrary feat, And casts as clear words as eyes have uttered into so much darkness, That it is hard to know what he said. Take here one instance, You have it in his Page 217. Where he Interpret's that plain passage of *S. Austen. Tom. 6. 1. Epist. Fund: C. 5. I would not believe the Gospel unless the Authority of the Church moved me thereunto*, And to obscure this most manifest and profoundly well expressed Truth, The Gentleman spends three whole pages in Guesses and conjectures, And it is to Unsay what the Saint had most evidently Asserted. Forsooth, he tell's vs, What the Controversy was which he then discussed. 2. What Church that was which moved him to believe the Gospel, Here He Guesses and Misses. 3. In what way and manner, the Churches Authority did move him, And

In this particular Mr Stillingfleet err's grossly, who will needs persuade vs, That *s. Austin* believed not the Divinity of Scripture vpon the Churches Authority, But only the Authenticalness of the Writings of the Apottles and Euangelists: As if to belieue the Authenticalness of the Gospel, could be separated from belieuing that very Gospel to be *Divine*. Its à whimsy As shall appear afterward. In the mean while you see How all these Coniectures laid together (I meddle not with them at present) are incomparably lesse clear than *S. Austin's* plain words, Yet I must so far put out my eyes, as to esteem them the only light to regulate my iudgement by, and consequently make Non-sense of *s. Austins* clear Expression. Is it not reasonable think you, Before I do so, To ask first by what Principle I may know That these Coniectures hit right?

*S. Austin*  
very clear,  
made ob-  
scure.

2. Now here you haue what I wish the iudicious Reader seriously To reflect vpon. Suppose one should follow Mr Stillingfleet through all those windings and Turnings wherewith he encumber's this one short Sentence of *s. Austin*, And Answer step by step to euery Paragraph in order. Suppose Hee that vnder-takes such à Task should in like manner proceed through all The Gentlemans *Rational Account* (as 'Tis Called) And attend to his discourses, reply to euery particular of his endles Glosses, laid on Scripture and other Fathers. Suppose Thirdly, He should rigidly Examine euery circumstance related in the Stories of that voluminous Book (Doe only thus much and you draw the book dry For besides cauls you haue no more) How many volumes think ye would This way of Answering bring forth to the world, before the whole *Account* were Answered? And when all is done, Much, God knows, is not done to end Controuersies with Satisfaction. Thus the contest goes on.

What the  
Reader is  
desired to  
reflect on.

3. Mr Stillingfleet like one affraid to meddle with sound Principles begins to Glosse, His supposed Aduersary, because no better stuff is giuen to work vpon, goes not yet deeper into difficulties, But turn's to the Scripture and Fathers, Read's and judges by His own Reading That much is interpreted amiss in

*Much Con-  
fusion follo-  
wes this  
way.*

this *Rational Account*, Therefore *Unghosts* as fast as Mr *Stillingfleet* glossed, And hopes He doth very well. Mr *Stillingfleet* discour-  
ses; This Aduersary doth so also, But finds, or pretends to  
find (I say no more yet) His discourses vnfound at the bottom.  
And too weak to bring in à good Conclusion.. Mr *Stillingfleet*  
relates his Stories, set forth with à number of circumstances,  
Our supposed Aduersary discouers (As he thinks) many à Flaw,  
many à Mistake, much iumbling, much disorder in the Narra-  
tion of his Circumstances. Reflect well good Reader. Doe you  
not see here à strange Confusion? When after the vtmost done  
by these two Aduersaries, You haue two quite different Doctrins  
raised from the same Authorities of Scripture and Fathers? And  
that after the recourse of both to History, You haue two as diffe-  
rent Stories told you, as *Yes*, and *No*. In like manner after Their  
long discourses, You haue two contradictory Conclusions drawn  
out, And laid before your eyes to read.. Vpon what Principle  
(if no more be Said) can the yet perplexed Reader come to so  
much certainty of our Christian Truths, as is necessary to Sa-  
uation? By what means shall He know, whether of these Two,  
relates the truer Story, Glosses, or discourses better? O, He  
must peruse Ecclesiastical History, Scripture also, And the Volu-  
mes of Fathers And then iudge. Pitiful. More than half the  
world want's means to doe this, And He who is able to comply  
with that laborious Task, must at last trust to his own Iudge-  
ment. However, giue me one who will conform Himselfe to  
what he Reads, and not draw all to à preiudicated Iudgement,  
That man will find out Catholick Religion.

*The Catho-  
licks Prin-  
ciple far  
more easy  
and plain.*

4. Be it how you will, The Catholick has à better And far  
more easy Principle to rely on in so weighty à Matter, whereof  
we shall Treat largely in the next Discourse. The Sectary has  
no other Ground to set footing on, But his own priuate Fancy.  
And here is the true Reason why he lones à life to stand dis-  
lying with you vpon Authority and History. Goe no further, He  
is sure to haue some Reply at hand, For it is easy to trifle à  
long time, whilst you only giue him this *Auburny* And that  
Paul

Disc. 1. C. 19. To end Controuersies. 195

Quarrel of History to quarrel with. The one, as we haue seen, Hewrest's to what Sense he pleases; On the other He can put so fair a Varnish by concealing some Circumstances, and iumbling others together, That the eyes of a vulgar Reader are easily dazled. In the mean time He warily waues (And is well content to doe so) The last sound Principles which only can end Controuersies. Wherefore, Methinks one cannot fit the Sectaries. Humour better, than to attaque him with Authorities, And next leaue the Glossing them to his fancy, To recurr to Antiquity, And permit him to put an other face on the whole Story. Thanks be to God the Catholick Writers of our own Nation (to say nothing of others) who handle Matters most profoundly, And in real truth haue already brought these debates to a Period, giue no such Aduantage to Sectaries, But relying on sound Principles, as learnedly reiect these Glosses, as our new men wilfully make them without Principles. Yet this is Truth. As nouellists can do no more But Gloss without Principles, So as I said now, They are well enough content if the Catholick will doe something like them, And only interpret or discourse vpon Authorities; And this I call the *less*, or not the *last* plain way of Ending debates. Goe no further, they think Themselves safe. For example. Read *S. Austin* in the place now cited. I would not belieue the Gospel &c. Ponder His whole Context, attend to his learned Discourse, Mark well how He both dispures and proues: That he would not belieue the Gospel as Gods *Diuine Word* but vpon This solid ground, That the *Authority of the Church*, then when he wrote, moued him to belieue so. Descend yet to other particulars taken from his most Connexed way of Arguing, Allege all plainly against the Sectary which hath been done and most landably again and again by Catholick Authors, Yet after all, you see Mr *Stillingsfleet* begins new Quarrels as fiercely, as if nothing had been said, And if one should vnrauel what he hath wouen in his three pages, would not he, think ye, to prolong these vnfortunate Strifes possibly find something to except against you? And must not you to vnbequile the Reader once more

What Sectaries would be at it



reply, And except against all his new Exceptions? How long may controuersies not yet brought to the last plain Principles, run on without ending? A shorter way Therefore must be thought of. And thus it is.

*The clearest  
way of en-  
ding contro-  
uersies.*

5. Take only that Positiue Doctrin which the Protestant plainly makes his own dogmatical Assertion, when he either Adds his new Gloss to an obscure Authority, or cast's one clear for Catholick Religion, into darknes. If you will haue Scripture, Quote that Passage of the Apostle. *The Church is the Pillar and ground of Faith. This is my body*, or what els you like best. If Fathers, Cite *S. Cyril of Hierusalem. S. Iustin Martyr*, or any other quoted aboue in defense of the Real Conuersion of bread into Christs Sacred Body. This done. First consider well, what Church speak's most Conformably to the obuious Sense of these Authorities.

2. Distinguish exactly between the Sectaries Gloss, which contain's his Doctrin, And the plain words of that Authority which he Interpret's; Withall, Ponder how little these two look like one another, How little their Gloss. *This is a Sign of my Body*, hath to doe with our Sauours clear Expression. *This is my body*.

3. Stay not too long vpon the Energy of a Testimony Though plain in your behalf, nor weigh ouer much the Circumstances wherein it was spoken, For though both be well done, yet This fitt's the Sectaries Humour, Who waits for such *By-Matters*. And in his Answers (as I haue often obserued) To shift off what mainly vrgeth, will giue you work enough, with his *Suppositions*, his *May-bes*, And endles *Winding's*. What is then to be done when he supposes his coniectures or Glosses to be true. Doctrin? This way I am sure is very solid.

*The Sectary  
is urged.*

6. Propose with all moderation These following Questions. Haue you, Sir, any Orthodox Church euer since Christianity began (I am sure you haue no expresse Scripture) which without dispute as plainly deliuered the Doctrin contained in your Gloss, as you now plainly Teach it? Haue you any Orthodox Council which without Exception as Clearly defined it, as you now Assert it? Haue you any Tradition, which by a continued Succession

tion Age after age conueyed vnto you the Tenets you pretend to find in some few Fathers, And now publish to the world as *Christian Truths*? If you ground your Glosses or Doctrin on such excellent Principles, we Catholicks are certainly in Errour, And ought to conform to your reformed Gospel, But if you fail (and fail you must) to doe thus much, if you only giue vs empty Glosses without further Proofs, we look on them as slight things cast off by the Orthodox world, as both vnprincipled and vnpatronized. Therefore *Scriptureless* as they are, *Churchless* as they are, they fall of Themselues to nothing, And bring vtter ruin to your new Machin of Protestancy.

7. I doe you no wrong when I draw you off your Glosses to an Orthodox Church. (The world was neuer without one). Say therefore, in Gods name, where, or when was such an Orthodox Christian Society in Being that positively taught no *Transubstantiation*, No *sacrifice of the Mass*, No *inuocation of Saints* &c? Where or when were your Councils which positively defined these Doctrins &c? You may Answer, and truely. You haue indeed neither Church, nor Councils, Nor Tradition Express for these your *Negatives*. Very right. Therefore I wrong you not in saying, your whole Cause subsist's vpon Coniectures, cauils, And Glosses, Because now you cast your selues into an Impossibility of pleading by any better Principles than meer guessees are. Thus much supposed, Say, I beseech your, What auail's it, if, when an Authority is plain for Popery, that you can by à nimble gloss darken it? Or if obscure; You haue *A Fiat lux*, at hand, and can charm it into so much Clarity as may suffice to dazle the eyes of à vulgar Reader? What Satisfaction haue I here, or what gain you by this Proceeding, when you know we haue more witnesses ready to attest, yea to dye for our Catholick Verities, than you haue hairs on your head, or Glosses in your book? What gain you to your cause could you misinterpret all the Fathers that euer wrote, when you without the warrant of any Orthodox Society haue yet à whole learned Church, Her Councils and Tradition against you? And all the store of Ammunition left you to ataque this

To point at  
his Church  
and Councils  
which  
taught Pro-  
testancy.

without  
them no sa-  
tisfaction is  
given.

great Oracle of Truth, is very small, no more, God knows, but a flash of lightning borrowed from the *Ignis fatuus* of your far-fetched Glosses. Gloss on, Caill on, coniecture on to the worlds end. As long as no known or Owned Principle distinct from Glosses and coniectures Support's them, You only beat the aire, or, (to use à pretty late phrase amongst you,) lapwing-like Pew most when furthest from the nest. I mean, you are then most fierce to end Controuersies, when you are furthest off from Principles, which only can end them.

8. Thus then you should proceed had not God and Truth silenced you. I, E. S. B. D. declare to you honest Papists, That in the Sixth or seauenth age after Christ, His true Orthodox Church, positiuely taught *no Transubstantiation*. Such à Council, either in former or later Ages expressly defined so. Then, and before also, Church Tradition was vniuersally for my Doctrin, And thus much I can make good to the learnedest Romanist among you. Wonder not Therefore when you quote your *Iustins*, your *Cyprians*, your *Chrysostoms*, seemingly contrary to my Church Doctrin, That I interpret all; I am forced to doe so, or against conscience must desert my old *Mother Church*, Her Councils and Tradition likewise, From which You haue too licentiously swerved, to side with your *Iustins* and I know not who els. Could the Sectary plead after this manner, His Glosses would haue force, But he neuer meddles with the First main *Business*, That is, neuer ground's his Doctrin vpon any thing like à satisfactory Principle, But, as if He minded to tire Ones patience, run's on headlong with Glosses, *When he has no Principled Doctrin to Glorify*. Iust as if One should tell his neighbour, Sir you lye, And this I auert to your face, Though I want where withall to proue my Saying true. In all these Controuersies Sectaries are so perdy vnciuil, as to giue the Lie to à whole Church, And what supports the Boldnes? Haue they any other Church more Orthodox, Councils more learned, Tradition more vniuersal to proue we ly, than our Church, our Tradition, And Councils are which say we speak truth? Nothing at all like them. We here challenge them

How Secta-  
ries ought  
to plead.

them to speake to the cause and controuersies are ended. What then remain's to plead with? Plain Scripture? *Not a word.* Fathers plain? *Not one.* O yes, *Tertullian* is drawn in to help at a dead lift, so is *Theoderet*. And one or two more. Very true. But he is a glossed *Tertullian*, a glossed *Theoderet* &c. Separate then these Glosses from the Fathers genuin Doctrin, giue them the Sectary to manage, you see him in open field compleatly armed ready to encounter *Church*, *Councils*, *Tradition*. And all the other Principles of the Catholick world. Are not Glosses think ye strong and prodigiously powerful, which haue not only force to plead against a whole Church, But more ouer to implead her of palpable error? This Church is supposed to haue changed Her ancient Doctrin, And Sectaries will reform it not by recurring to any other more Orthodox Society of Christians, But by meer guesses and Glosses. That is. *The Fallible Glosses and guesses of men confessedly fallible, must reform a Church which hold's Her selfe infallible.* And proves it also.

*Glosses  
strangely  
powerful  
with Secta-  
ries.*

9. Thus it is, Christian Reader. I speak plainly, And can defend my Assertion. Besides meer begging the Question in all Disputes, besides Cauils, And weak coniectures, The Sectary hath no more left him to oppose our Catholick Tenets, but meer vnprincipled Glosses. I neither word it nor wrong Protestants in saying thus much. Peruse if you please their writings, chiefly Mr *Stillingfleets Account*, you will find (when the Churches *Infallibility*, or *Transubstantiation* &c. Happen to be handled, That Glosses laid on the Authorities vsually quoted for Catholick Doctrin, euer take vp the most room. And which is worse, yea pitifull in a *Rational Defender* of Protestancy: *You shall neuer find* through this whole Book (waue Cauils, coniectures and Glosses) one sound Principle laid plainly forth, nor so much as hinted at, in behalf of any Protestant Article. What think ye? Shall Christians, who would fain haue a Church to liue in, see the old House of God pulled down by vnhandy Glossers, before They haue a better built vp, And well settled on good Foundations? *Pulled down.* What say I? Alas our Glossers haue not strength

*Yet Most  
weak and  
feeble.*

strength to vntile it, much less force to demolish that long standing Fortress. Yet Glosses chiefly, And t'is à sad thought for the Sectary, support his vndefensible Schism made in the desperate quarrel against that Church which gaue his Ancestors Baptism. These only (there is no more) must plead in behalf of his inhuman and barbarous Reformation; These finally must answer before an Impartial Iudge at that great day of Doom for all his merciless cruelty practised vpon the deceased, and some yet liuing Catholicks. Sad thoughts, I say, they are to goe to bed with, to rise with, to banquet with, which like Ghosts will haunt him to his dying day, And lay Torment at his restless hart in his greatest tollities, And more in the houre of death.

*The Conclusion against Sellaris.*

10. After all you see the Conclusion and an end put to Controversies. *If no Orthodox Church uphold's this Protestancy, or any article of it. (which is euident). No Councils nor Tradition can support it. If no Councils nor Tradition support it. It has no Principled Doctrin. If no Principled Doctrin, No Moral certainty. If no Moral certainty, (for meer groundles Glosses cannot giue any against all the Powerful Motiues of our Church) there is no Probability in it. If no Probability; The Whole Reformation must be reduced to zero only. There we found it, And there leaue it.*

11. Now, if any except against our casting off Protestancy from the meanest degree of *Probability* induced to Iudge otherwise vpon this ground, That many learned men defend it. I have Answered aboue. *Meer Probability is insufficient to support Christian Truths.* Here I both answer and Ask. 2. where were the many learned Defenders of this new Faith, when one Luther stood vp alone against the whole Christian world, And first broached his Protestancy? If at that time there was no Authority nor reason for the Nouelty, Process of time hath gained it neither. Look then into its *Roots* or First beginning, you'll find it vfound at the bottom, yea vtterly improbable vpon this certain Principle, That the Singular Doctrin of one disgusted Rebel against à whole Church and Thousands more pious and learned than Himselfe, can merit no Belief, but deserues (what it has), to be Anathematized.

12. We must yet insist à little vpon this Point, And lay forth the Vanity of our Aduersaries pretence to Probability, which done, you shall see controuersies are ended. Sectaries May say. If their own Authority makes not Protestancy Morally certain, it cannot but raise it to à high degree of Probability. We deny this, And shall presently Ask, why their Authority more aduanceth this Religion to Probability than the meer Authority of Ariens bring's Arianism to Probability? At present we do not only oppose the voice and vote of the Roman Catholick Church against this Plea, But the Authority also of *Gracians, Abyssins* and all other called *Christians*, who with one vnanimous Consent decry Protestancy as improbable. Compare therefore *votes* with *votes*, *Authority* with *Authority*, There is no Parallel; For, for one that defend's it, you haue hundreds, yea Thousands that Contradict the Nouelty. Thus much is indisputably Euident, if we precisely Consider Authority as it were in *Abstracto*, or oppose the Votes of dissenting Parties against it. But here is not all. We must goe further, And distinguish well between à *bare Authority*, and a *rational grounded Authority*. For this is an vdeniable Truth. *Reasonable Principles* euer preceede, or are presupposed, when Religion is pleaded for To the consequent Authority of those (whether many or few) that Teach, or Profess it. Hence all say. If the first conuerted Iewes to Christianity, Had not had most weighty Inducements proposed to reason before they deserted Iudaism and believed in Christ The change had been most imprudent; Nay, all had been obliged, as is proued in the 4. Chaprer, To hold on in that Profession still without Alteration. So necessary it is to haue rational grounds laid firm in the Foundation of Religion, before the Professors allow it either Moral certainty, or so much as Probability. Thus much premised.

*Protestancy  
improbable.*

13. We draw Sectaries from all Self-Voting; or further pleading by their own Authority, And force them in this Contest, if Protestancy be defensible, not to say, but to proue by Principles, distinct from their own bare votes, These two Propositions. 1. That God who is Truth it self, And once laid his Truths the foundation

*Sectaries  
drawn off  
their own  
Self-voting.*



*What the  
Sectary is to  
Prove.*

dation of the Roman Catholick Church, permitted that faithful Oracle to become Traiterous, to teach Idolatry, to tell the world loud Lies for à thousand yeares together. And that all this happened, when there was no other Orthodox Church on earth to vnbeguile Those poor deluded Christians. The second Proposition to be proued, is. That these Millions of souls learned and vnlearned who firmly belieued this Church And dyed happily in it, were All mad, All Idolaters, All besotted and seduced by Fooleries : And (which is à Paradox aboue Expression) That à knot of late vnkown Nouellists pretending to Reformation, dare now attempt to teach men more learned than Themselves, To make these supposed *mad, Wise, The Idolatrous, Orthodox, the besotted, Reasonable; The Seduced, right in Faith again; And that this was, and is yet done vpon à meer proofles Supposition, (that we are mad and besotted)* which stand's on no Principles, And for that reason is contradicted by the vast number of most knowing Catholicks, And the whole Multitude of Christians Besides.

*The difficulty  
proposed  
between Cath-  
olicks and  
Protestants.*

14. When these two Propositions are made probable vpon good Principles, Wee shall listen to our Sectaries Authority, But if they fumble herein, Only talk and proue nothing. Wee reiect their vngrounded Authority And say, The more votes they multiply without Proofs, the less weight they haue. You shall yet see how weightles Their Authority is, might we here insist longer vpon one Matter of fact which ends all Controuerfies. In à word. All know the great Controuerfity between Protestants and Catholicks comes to this. Whether they or we teach Apostolical Doctrin? Whether they or we lay forth the genuine sense of holy Scripture? Neither Party saw or heard the Apostles Preach. Neither pretend's now to *Enthusiasms*, or priuate Reuelations concerning that Doctrin : The whole cause therefore is to be tried, and decided by Witnesses of foregoing Ages, such Testimonies and Tradition must clear this Matter of fact. A pretence to Scripture only without precedent lawful Pastors, without Doctors, without Witnesses teaching that sense and Doctrin

Doctrin which the one, or other Party stand's for, is here both  
 viles and impertinent. If then The Protestant makes his Doc-  
 trin Apostolical, His sense of Scripture, Orthodox; The Catho-  
 lick replies. Be pleased to giue in your last Euidence, produce  
 your Witneses; your Pastors, And Doctōrs Four Ages since,  
 That taught as you teach, And senced Scripture as you sence it.  
 My Church (add's the Catholick) evidently demonstrates a con-  
 tinued succession of Her Pastors that taught as I belieue, ( as  
 shall be proued hereafter ) And shewes as clearly a Succession of  
 the same Doctrin and Faith with these Pastors. Her Antiquity  
 is vndoubted, and her pleading *Possession* in proseruing the true  
 Sence of Scripture and Apostolical Doctrin, is as great as any  
 King on earth can shew for the Possession of the Crown he  
 weares. Now, saith the Catholick, Wee examin your pede-  
 gree of Pastors and Doctōrs, And after some few Ascents by a  
 Retrogradation come at last to the year 1517. There we find,  
 and most evidently, a Luther, or Caluin To be the first men in  
 the world that professed Protestantism, that interpreted Scripture  
 as you interpret, or owned your Religion. With these late  
 Runagates you must stop, No man on earth can aduance or  
 bring your *Genealogy* further, Therefore to speak in the words of  
 the Ancient Optatus Misenian. Lib. 2. *Contra Parmen*: At that  
 time, you were sons without Progenitors, successors without a Pedegree  
 New Teachers without commission, Protestants indeed, but without  
 Principles.

The first  
 p'ead by  
 Principles  
 the others  
 not.

15. Hence I argue and it is a demonstration against Secta-  
 ries. If neither Church, nor Councils, nor Pastors, nor Doc-  
 tors, nor any Orthodox Christians in forgoing Ages euer owned,  
 or so much as heard of Protestancy before one vnfortunate Fa-  
 therles Luther broached it; If no Antiquity, so much as once  
 mentioned one Professor of that Religion; if no Tradition han-  
 ded to Luther the new Faith he taught (all which is without  
 dispute manifest) Protestancy most evidently is vpon this very  
 account both an *Unwitnessed* and an *Unprincipled* Religion, And not  
 only improbable, but in the highest degree improbable. But

no Authority can release an vnprincipled Nouelty from its own intrinsick, miserable and *essential* state of improbability, Therefore our Sectaries votes (of no weight at all) cannot make it probable. And thus Controuersies are ended, because an improbable Religion (And for this reason improbable, because vnprincipled) is not defensible.

*Protestancy  
as improba-  
ble as  
Arianism.*

16. To add more to this Discourse I Ask, whether one Arius opposing the whole Church represented in the Nicene Council, defended probable Doctrin or no? You will answer *No*. Very good. Yet he quoted Scripture (and might one insist vpon the exteriour letter or sound of words) more plain and expresse in the behalf of his Heresy, than all the Protestants on earth can produce *Fathers* plain and *Expresse* for their Nouelty of Protestantism. I would say. Neither *Theoderet* nor any other Father, speak's half so clearly to the Doctrin of *No Transubstantiation*. *No Sacrifice of the Mass* &c. As these words (to omit others). *My Father is greater then I*, (may the exteriour letter regulate here) seemingly expresse an inequality between the Father and the Son. Now if the seeming clear sound of Scripture made not Arius his Doctrin probable against the Church. *Then*, much less can the more obscure Testimonies of some Fathers, make the Doctrin of Protestants probable against the Church. *Now*. And if we speak of followers that Arius gained in his time, There is no comparison, He had more than euer England had Protestants in it.

*The Arians  
not Convin-  
ced by Scrip-  
ture only.*

17. One may yet reply. The Nicene Fathers cited plain Scripture against Arius. Very true. And so do Catholicks against Protestants, For, Christs Sacred words. *This is my body*, are as significantly plain against Protestantism, as any Text those Fathers then vrged, or yet can be vrged against *Arianism*. But this you see did not the deed, nor was then the last conviction, And why? Here is the reason. Because as Protestants now wilfully Gloss this plain Passage of Scripture and many others, So the Arians then wilfully Glossed all those Scriptures alleged by the Nicene Fathers. And yet hold on in that strain to our very dayes, as you may read in *Crellius* and *Volkeltius*. Yet more.

more. As the Arian Party then only Glossed but without the help of any antecedent Church Doctrin known to the world; or vniuersal Tradition to settle their Glosses on; So our Protestants now do the very same, There is no disparity betwixt them; They Gloss, 'tis true, but giue vs Churchles Glosses. Finally, as those Fathers at that time did not only reiect the Ariens Glosses, but established also their own Definitions vpon Scripture interpreted by the known deliuered Doctrin of the *then present*, and the more *Ancient Church* ( for they represented both ) And thus ended that Controuersy, So we Catholicks proceed against Protestants, And bring all debates to the like last period. *The Church, or nothing, must end them.* Without recourse had to the known and owned Doctrin both of this present and precedent faithful Oracle, They and we may interpret Scripture long enough, They may Cauil, And we may hold on in our Answers to the end of an other Age, without hope of ending so much as one Controuersy. But of This enough is said already.

*How Con-  
uicted*

## CHAP. XX.

*A word to one or two Obiections. It is further proued;  
That Controuersies are ended with Protestants,  
who haue no Essence of Religion, but  
false opinions only.*

1. **S**ectaries may object first. We Suppose all this while  
*But proue not*, The Orthodox world to haue hitherto maintained the Doctrin now taught by the Roman Catholick Church concerning *Transubstantiation, Inuocation of Saints &c.* Therefore our Discourse seem's vngrounded. I answer. 1. The Reply is not to the Purpose in this place, whilst we only press

206 Disc. 1. C. 20. *Protestancy has no Essence*

*The first  
Objection  
answered.*

Sectaries to giue in Proofs for their Contrary Positions. Thus wee say They Cannot doe: Now if wee bee as farr of From Proofoes, or Cannot ground our Tenets vpon vndubitable Principles; Controuersies are ended without more Adoe; Because both of vs, (if the Supposition hold's,) haue no Articles of Religion to Propugn, But weak opinions, which (whether true or false) import not Salvation: Nay, the Truth of them, could be known, is scarce worth any mans Knowledge. I Answer. 1. Our Proofs (to say no more now) Stand firm vpon Church Authority, once at least owned Orthodox, on our Councils, and antient Tradition neuer yet repealed, nor excepted against, But by Hereticks only. May it please our Aduersaries to come Closely to the Point and plead in behalf of their Tenets, by the Authority of any like or better Church than ours. We haue done, and must yeild; But this they know is impossible. And therefore neither will nor can Answer our Discourse. If they say our Church, (where its contrary to Protestancy) is errred, Vrge them to proue the Assertion by any Principle, either equal to (or stronger than) our Church Authority is, And you will haue them driuen again to their Glosses, or to some few gleanings of Fathers, In a word to no Principles.

*A second  
Objection  
Proposed.*

2. They may object. 2. We haue took much pain to proue Nothing against Protestancy, For we know, some late Professors namely *Doctor Bramhall* and *M<sup>r</sup> Stillingfleet*, still maintain these Negatiues of *No Transubstantiation*, *No Sacrifice of the Mass*, *No Invocation of Saints* &c. To be only *pious Opinions* or *inferiour Truths*, Neither reuealed by God, nor *Essential* to Protestant Religion, Therefore whilst we vrge them to ground such Negatiues vpon plain Scripture, vpon the Authority of an Orthodox Church, Councils, Tradition &c. They tell vs we meddle not at all with the *Essentials* of Protestancy, But only dispute against Opinions, And, Contrary to iustice, force them to proue meer opinions by Scripture, Church &c. which is more than we can press vpon them, or doe our selues, For haue not we *Catholicks many Opinions in Schools*, which none pretend to ground

ground vpon so strong Principles as we settle our Articles of Faith on? Yes most assuredly: Opinions then and Articles of Faith cannot but be very differently Principled. And thus the Protestant discourses in the present Matters, Here saith He, is the only difference, That Catholicks lay Claim to *more* Articles of Faith, And the Protestants to *Fewer*. Our more numerous Articles, ouer and aboue His fundamentals, He calls opinions, Holds vnrincipled, And hopes to settle his fewer articles, *or the Essence* of his Religion vpon Excellent solid Grounds.

*Point's  
at a distinction  
between  
Faith and  
Opinion.*

3. Hence it followes, that all Controuersies hitherto agitated between vs come to no more, but to a slight skirmishing about different opinions only; For we and they agree in the Essence of Religion. *Unlucky opinions* surely, Cries the Sectary (and He would seem to sigh as deeply as we, But has not felt so much Smart) which haue caused endles Broiles, strange confusion, and a Shameful Schism in the Christian world. Thus much I conceiue some later men, who expressly teach the Doctrin would haue vs learn, And because it is a new inuented way of defending this falling Protestancy, I hold my self obliged, First to discouer the whole fallacy of the discourse, Next to shew how Protestants themselves put an end to all Controuersies. This done the Obiection is soon answered.

4. The fallacy lies here, That Protestancy is supposed to haue an *Essence* when really it has none, but is wholly made vp of worse then false opinions. The false Supposition stands gloriously in Mr Stillingfleets empty Title. *A rational Account of the grounds of Protestant Religion.* The man surely imagins Protestancy to be a Religion (which implies an *Essence*,) yea and grounded too. I say the contrary, it has no *Essence*, and consequently *No grounds*. To proue my Assertion, Doe no more but cast out of Protestancy all the Negatiues it has, which confessedly are no *Essentials*. And next fix your thoughts on the little which remain's, And is called Protestancy. You will see the *Essence* after these Negatiues are gone, dwindle to nothing. Most surely

*The fallacy,  
discouered.*



Surely this is not its *Essence* To believe these *Negatives*, *pious opinions*, or *inferiour Truths*, For if God neuer revealed the *Negatives*, He neuer revealed to any, That the *Belief* of their *supposed party* constitutes the *Essence* of *Protestancy*. An other *Essence* Therefore must be found out, if it haue any, And may be it is this. *Believe the Creeds or à Doctrin common to all Christians* (our *Aduersaries* hint at both) and you haue the *Whole Essence* of this *Religion*, Yea, and Faith enough to attain *Saluation*: And thus they reduce their Faith to fewer *Articles* than we doe. I might Say à word in passing, And reduce all true *Christian Faith* to à shorter *compendium*. viz. To one only *Article* of The *Apostles Creed*. I believe the *holy Catholick Church*. That is, who euer own's the true *Church* of *Christ*, and firmly adheres to all She teaches after à due *Proposall* made of her *Articles*, And dies in that Faith; such à man iointly belieues both the *Church* and *Credo* also. But if he run away with one half only, or Talk of *Credo*, as *Sectaries* doe, without à *Church*, And exclude from His *Belief* that *Church* which approoves the *Creeds*, He separates that which cannot be separated, And is à *Self-chuser*. In à word he neither belieues *Church* nor *Creeds*, And consequently has no *Christian Faith*.

An other  
Sectarian  
pretence of  
belieuing the  
Creeds.

5. Hence I say. This very Assertion. I believe the *Credo* in the *sense* of *Sectaries* now explicated, is so far from being à *Principled Truth*, That it is no more but an *Errour*, or à *prophane Protestant Opinion*, As bad or worse as any of the *Negatives* are. If therefore they make it an *Essential Article* of *Protestancy*, Wee press them according to their promise, to giue à *rational Account* of it before God and man. And here our *Quarrel* above come in again. Haue you, *Gentlemen*, any *Diuine Revelation*, That this half Faith of believing *Creeds*, after your bold retreating from the *Church* is so sufficient for your *Saluation* and mine, That more is not required? Did euer *Orthodox Church* expressly teach this to be sufficient? Did euer ancient *Council* define so, or *vniversal Tradition* deliuer the *Doctrin*? Speak plainly plead by all, or any one of these *Principles*, And I haue done

done. But 'tis impossible. Perhaps you will say All Antiquity and the Fathers likewise highly commend the Apostles Creed as a short *Abridgement* of our Christian Faith. Answer: So doe we as highly, But know there are different Lectiōs of it, whereof you may read in your own Doctor *Vshers Diatriba. De Symbolis*, London Print. 1647. Sent to his friend *Joannes Vossius*. We know again, (may Credit be giuen to S. Hierome. *Epist. 61. Ad Pammach.*) That this Creed was not writ *in Chartâ & atramento*, but in *tabulu Cordis*, And Therefore we must trust to Tradition for the best Lectiō. All other Creeds euen that ascribed to S. Athanasius (*A Græcis interpolatum* dressed vp à new by the Greeks, Saith Dr Vsher) The Church either made or has approued. If then I must build my faith on these *Creeds*, I cannot diuorce it from the Church. For, *Propter quod vnumquodq; tale, est illud & magis tale*. If I belieue my *Creeds*, much more must I belieue the Church which either made or Authorised them.

6. In à word here is all we demand, And If Sectaries can Answer they speak to the purpose. Let them but name any Orthodox Council; Nay, one ancient Father that saies, Faith is then fully and sufficiently Catholick, if one belieues the *Creeds*, Though at that very time He pertinaciously reiect's the present Church we liue in, Or will not hear that Doctrin which She teaches about *The express Doctrin deliuered in the Creeds*, Let him, I say, do thus much And he speaks to the purpose, But it cannot be done, Because both the Ancient and modern Church condemn's all who slight Her Doctrin, though *not expressly* contained in the Creed. In this opposition therefore, That which the Sectary would make the *Essence* of his Religion is only his *false opinion*, and in real truth hath neither Moral certainty, nor so much as Probability, As is already proued. He may reply. All he pretend's, is, That the *Creeds* compleatly contain Matter enough of Christian belief, (To Add more is vnecessary), And Saies withall, Hee slight's not that Ancient Church, which either composed or approued the Ancient *Creeds*, but blames the Later Church which hath turned *meer Opinions* into *Articles* of faith,

*The Beliefs  
of Creeds  
and the  
Church,  
is inseparable.*

Dd

And

210 Disc. 1. C. 10. *Protestancy has no Essence*

And imposed them on Christians to believe. *Ans.* These men it seems will hold on to be unlucky in All They say. We are now inquiring after that Doctrin which essentially Constitutes Protestancy, And here they obtrude vpon vs their Protestant Opinions for Answer.

*False Opinions supposed the Essence of Protestancy.*

7. To assert Therefore First, that the Ancient *Creds* explicitly contain Matter enough of Christian Belief is a *Protestant opinion only*, largely refuted by our learned Writers. See the other Treatise Discourse. 3. C. 5. To assert that the Church in after ages added Vnnecessaries about the explicate Doctrin contained in the Apostles *Cred*, Impugn's the most Ancient Councils of the Christian world, And is no more but a *Protestant opinion*. To assert. 3. That the Ancient Church was right in faith, And the present Church not, or, That She hath imposed meer Opinions to be believed by Christians in place of Articles of Faith, is a flat Calumny an improbable opinion, which never yet was, nor can be grounded vpon any rational Principle. And can these opinions think ye which all Catholicks receive, pass for the grounded *Essence* of Protestancy? They must, or it has no *Essence* at all. And mark well, As they proceed with us here, so they doe in all other Controversies. They tell vs not only the *Creds*, but Scriptures much more contain all things necessary to Salvation, That's only their Opinion. They tell vs, *Their* Belief now, and that of the Primitive Christians for the first *Three*, or Four Centuries, is one and the same; It is their Opinion meerly, And demonstratiuely vntrue. They tell vs, They own a Church before Luther, but to say where, or when it was distinct from the Roman Catholick, or as They Imagine much larger than the Roman, is only an Opinion, and most improbable. In a word They are euery where so narrowly confined, That whether they build or destroy, Impugn our Religion or offer to establish their own, They neuer get out of the reach of Their own tottering improbable Opinions.

*Particular Proofs thereof.*

8. And because I find this strain runs through Mr *Stillingfleet's* whole Book, He cannot surely be iustly offended, if for my

my better Satisfaction concerning his *Rational Account*, I require his rational Answer to one Question which I hold very reasonable. Thus I propose it. You, Sir, defend à Religion called *Protestancy*, You allow it some essential Doctrin distinct from *Papery*, and all condemned *Hereticks*. Your Title supposeth this Doctrin well grounded (*The grounds of Protestant Religion*) Answer I beseech you, give me first without fumbling that Doctrin peculiar to Protestancy, which essentially makes it à Religion. Give vs the *specificall* difference of it, if't have any? And Next, Ground this Doctrin (be it what you will) vpon the undubitable Authority of some known Orthodox Church, Orthodox Councils, or vniuersal Tradition, but Fob vs not off with your vnprooued *Opinions*, Tell vs no more of believing *Creds only*, The Scripture *only*, the Four first general Councils *only* without more (these *Onelies* we except against) Yet doe you *only* thus much as I now require, (Tis easily done, if your cause be good,) And I will recall what euer I haue written against you, And craue pardon for my rashnesse. But the Catholick knowes well because Heresy can haue no grounded Doctrin, This task is impossible. I am now to shew the Protestant the impossibility of it also.

*A question  
proposed to  
Sectaries.*

9. Imagin one who belieues the *Creds*, as the Sectary pretends to doe, yet so, That interiourly And from his very heart He abiures and slights all those Negative Articles called the opinions of Protestants. (I speak not here of his exteriour demeanour nor Countenance his dissembling if't be so) My Question is this. Whether such à man haue internal, essential, sufficient faith to make him à true believing Protestant? He hold's himself one vpon this conuincing Reason, That he firmly belieues what euer the Professors of that Religion maintain as both essential and sufficient to Saluation. Besides He knowes well, No obligation lies on him to believe by *Faith*, the Negative Articles of Protestants, neither can he, because God has not reuealed them. Such à man therefore hath compleatly essential Faith enough, and is à true believing Protestant, or if

*Sectaries  
must make  
most Opinions  
their  
Articles of  
Faith.*

212 Disc. 1. C. 20. *Protestancy has no Essence*

He be not yet got so high, or haue not the Protestant Faith completely, necessary and sufficient to saue him, He must help it out by belieuing some one or other Protestant Opinion, And Consequently the Belief of Opinions must either constitute him essentially a *Protestant*, Or He will neuer be one, yet this is most untrue, for God obliges none to belieue vnreuealed Opinions as Articles of Faith.

*The difficulty further urged.*

10. We must goe yet further. Suppose this man belieues the *Creeeds*, The Roman Catholick Church and euery particular Doctrin She teaches, iust so as the best Catholick Belieues, And whereas before He only slighted the opinions of Protestants, now in place of them he firmly adheres to the Contrary Catholick Positions. viz. To *The Popes Supremacy. Transubstantiation. An vnbloody Sacrifice. Praying to Saints Worshipping of Images*, And in a word to all that the Church obliges me to belieue. This man in heart is certainly Catholick. I Ask whether he is yet a true belieuing Protestant? In our Sectaries Principles, He is. For first he belieues his *Creeeds* or Doctrin Common to all Christians, And there is the Essence of their sauing Faith. O but all is spoiled by *belieuing the Church*, And what euer Doctrin She teaches. Why so I beseech you? why should this spoile all, if in Conscience the man Iudges Her Articles to be reuealed Truth? A Catholick you say may be saued, Though he belieues thus much, Therefore there is no reason to damn this man vpon any Account of his want of Faith, For the Faith of His *Creeeds* saues him, And the beliefe of our Catholick Articles ruins not that Faith. Ergo. Again. You must say, His abiuring your Negative Opinions doth not *Vnprotestant* Him, if he belieues the *Creeeds*, why then should the firm adhering to our contrary Positive Catholick Articles (which you call opinions) make him less Protestant? You may reply. If He hold's them only as opinions, He is still Protestant, But we now suppose He belieues all as Articles of Faith. Very good. This then followes inevitably. Not to belieue them as Articles of Faith, besides Owning the *Creeeds*, essentially makes him Protestant, Ergo, This also followes

To

To believe some one Negative, or more then the Creeds Formally express (Add to them the common Doctrin of all Christians, The four General Councils &c.) is essentially necessary to Constitute him Protestant. Now This very More which is nothing but a Sectarian Opinion essentially enters in to make him Protestant, or Hee shall neuer bee one. Thus much I intended to proue, and I hold it proued demonstratiuely.

11. You haue what I would say, plainly laid forth in this vnamisable Dilemma. *He who iudges all the Negative Articles of Protestants false, And belieues the Contrary Positiues taught by our Catholick Church As reuealed Truths, is yet Protestant, or not. If not; the belief of some thing els (Truth or vntruth) is essentially requisite to make him Protestant, But the belief of That (be it what you will) now superadded to Constitute him a Believing Protestant, is no Truth reuealed by God, But only a Protestant Opinion, Without which he wants the Essence of that Religion, Ergo most evidently the Belief of Opinions essentially constitutes him a believing Protestant, Consequently some Doctrin which God has not reuealed makes him Protestant, And the belief of his Creeds is not Faith enough to make him one.* These Inferences seem eident, if not, I petition Mr Stillingfleet to discouer where the fallacy lies.

12. Now on the other side, if such a man as belieues his Creeds, the Roman Catholick Church, And all the Articles She teaches iust as I believe them, be notwithstanding essentially Protestant still, *He is both Protestant and Catholick together.* Catholick He is, whilst He Assents to all without Reserue which the Roman Church teaches; And he is also Protestant, for He belieues his Creeds, And what euer our new men require as essential to their Religion. Wherefore vnless The not-believing their Negatiues, or his submiss. yeilding to our Positiue Contrary Doctrins, destroy that essential Faith of his Creeds (which is impossible). He is in these Principles, both at once Catholique and Protestant.

13. And thus you see How Our new men end Controuersies, For now in their Principles, There is no more quarrel about



about Religion, The whole contest being purely brought to this whether Party Opines more securely, just as the *Thomists* and *Arists* (worthy learned Catholicks) dispute whether Schoole teaches the better Opinions, Though if the Supposition stand, it will be difficult to find out disputable Opinions between vs.

*As our  
Adversary  
is obliged to.*

14. Be it how you will, Mr Stillingfleet must of necessity change his Tittle [*The grounds of Protestant Religion*] For now Protestantism with him consists with Popery, or rather is Popery. And Popery, if we speak of Religion, is consistent with Protestantism. The Essence and grounds of the one and the other cannot but be the same, if (which is ever to be noted) Protestantism as Protestantism hath not one true essential Article of Orthodox Faith peculiar to it self, For having none, The Abettors of it must either be Catholicks, or Profess no Religion.

15. And here by the way you may note the difference between vs. As the Catholick own's all which the Church defines to be *de Fide* And necessary to Saluation, So contrariwise, the Protestant own's nothing within the compass of *His Article* to be *de Fide*, or in like manner necessary, For both He and I may boldly renounce what euer he hold's as Protestant without danger of losing our Souls. And hence it is that Opinions only, and false ones too, essentially constitute this whole Religion. I speak here of Articles proper to Protestantism, For to believe the *Credo*, the four General Councils, to Assert that the Sacraments giue grace to the worthy Receiuer, that Faith and repentance are necessary, or what els can be thought of, as *Matters of Diuine Faith*, All, I say, and euery one Constitute the essence of Catholick Religion, and are known Doctrins of the Roman Orthodox Church, in so much that the Protestant has no proper, special, or peculiar Tenet of Religion left him at all (which is true) to propugn. And for this reason He is obliged hereafter, *iure humano*, & *Diuino* to write no more Controversies of Religion, wanting Matter to write of, And no less obligation lies on him to leaue off all further quarrelling in behalf of his improbable Opinions. I would willingly see this plain discourse answered.

16. Some

16. Some perhaps not penetrating the force of it, may Reply. The old strife is now on foot again: For as we call the particular Tenets of Protestants, *Opinions*, and *improbable* also, So they in like-manner say, All that the Catholick Church maintains above the Common Doctrin of Christians or the Articles of the *Credo* &c, are only Church-Opinions, as improbable as Theirs. The Doctrin of *Transubstantiation* seem's as improbable to them, as *No-Transubstantiation* to vs. *Invocation of Saints* more improbable, than not to trouble Those blessed Spirits with our Prayers &c. *Answ.* The reply settled vpon no Foundation is more than simple, For either these men Cauil because we call their Negative Articles, *Opinions*, or Term them improbable *Opinions*. Sectaries themselves call them *Opinions*, that's vnexceptionably plain, Though they know well that the Church neuer speak's so meanly of her contrary Positive Doctrins. The only difficulty remaining is, whether they are improbable or no? And this stands most clearly evidenced already vpon an *undeniable Principle*. viz. That when Luther first broached them, They were opposite to the whole Orthodox world, And for that cause were then as improbable and Heteroclit as one Rebels vote is against a whole Kingdome, or as Arianism was against the Vniuersal Church. Now since that time they haue gained no more Probability than Arianism, And so the old Improbability still clings to them. And for this reason the Sectary is to find out a Catholick Church which defended his Negatiues, or any one specifical Tenet of Protestancy, as *Ancient*, or, *reputed as Orthodox*, as our Church then was, or is now: Thus much done we will allow more to his Opinions than Probability. But to doe it is Impossible.

17. Thus the first part of the Obiection aboue is solued. To That is added of our pressing Sectaries to proue their Negatiues by plain Scripture. I answer, we iustly exact so much proof of Mr Rogers and his Complices (the greater part of Protestants I think) who hold them *Articles of Faith*: These are to produce their Scriptures, And only vrge Doctor Bramhal and Mr

*A weak  
reply, an-  
swered.*

*who are to  
proue the  
Protestants.  
Negatiues.*

216 Disc. 1. C 10. *Protestancy has no Essence &c.*

and Mr Stillingfleet that call them *inferiour truths or pious Opinions*, to settle these *Negatives* or any Tenet of pure Protestancy vpon is much as any thing like à Probable Principle, And here we expect their last *Propositis quiescent* for Probability, But this cannot be giuen, whilst we know, The true Church of Christ denies them as *improbable, and Heretical errors*.

*How Catho-  
lick Opini-  
ons differ  
Protestancy.*

18. It is very true (and that's next objected) Catholicks have opinions in schools differently Principled from Articles of Faith, but t'is nothing to the purpose, when the difference betwixt these and our Sectaries Tenents, is, that Catholick opinions, if probable, are euer reduced to probable grounds, our Sectaries opinions contrary to the voice and iudgement of à whole Church, can haue no such foundation And for this cause we iustly impugn them not as False Opinions only, but as *Heresies*. Now to the last Plea of Sectaries making fewer Articles of Faith than the Church doth, The Answer is easy. It belongs not to them, God knowes, wholly vnknown to the world one Age past, To giue vs now à right measure of Faith, The attempt is no less vain, than prodigiously bold. But Say on, How will they Abbreuiate? By what Rule? By what law? By their improbable opinions. Here is all. Well therefore may they Lament these vnlucky Opinions, which haue ruined many à poor Soul and giuen infinit Scandal to the Christian world. *Psalmi illi per quem Scandalum venit.*

CHAP. XXI.

*Protestants granting Saluation to Catholicks by à clear inference drawn from their Concession end Controuersies of Religion. VVhat force their concession hath. VVhy they granted so much. The Argument is clearly proposed. Mr Stillingfleet return's no probable answer. A full discovery of his fallacies.*

1. Some may think the particular Matter now hinted at too largely handled being scarce worth halfe the labour here spent vpon it, And They iudge right, Should I once so much as offer to proue, as Mr Stillingfleet fondly Imagin's, the Roman Catholick Church à safe way to saluation because Protestants Say so. Far bee it from mee to entertain such à Thought, For whether They side with vs, or not, Wee haue absolute Certainty of our Faith independently of Their suffrages, or Voting vs in à Secure way to Heauen. Wherefore Should Sectaries recoile, And say wee are all damned ( as some haue done) wee regard it not, That would no more Lessen the Certainty wee now haue of sound Faith, than Their Casual Granting vs Saluation in the way wee are in, Heightens it.

*Absolute  
Certainty  
of Faith  
without de-  
pendence of  
Sectaries.*

2. 'Tis true, were it doubtful ( or no more but Probable ) whether Catholicks Could bee saued in their Religion, The agreeing of Sectaries with vs might serue for something, But now, when the Certainty of our Doctrin Stand's, as wee here Suppose most secure vpon an Infalible Principle ( which is Church Authority ) The Proof taken from the Agreement of both Parties is an Impertinency, And in real Truth, *De subiecto*

E c

NON

218 Disc. 1. C. 21. Protestants granting Salvation.

non-supponents, That is, Not to bee supposed, if (which is euer to bee noted) wee should goe about to strengthen our Catholick Doctrin, because Heretiques Agree with vs.

*An Argument against them upon their Concession.*

3. Howeuer, though the Agreement, Considered in it selfe, be no more but a fallible Protestant Opinion, yet laid by the other indubitable Doctrin of the Catholick Church 'Tis a Truth, as asserted by them, And ties their tongues so fast, that They shall Nener hereafter speak a probable word against our Catholick Faith. Again, the Concession presses Sectaries *Ad hominem*, who admit Scripture vpon the General Agreement of all Called Christians. If therefore They argue well: *Both you Catholicks and wee Protestants hold these books Divine*, Ergo, They are so. Wee Argue as strongly: Both Parties also grant saluation to Catholicks, ergo They are so secure, that it is impossible to plead against the Truth, Though as I said now, The Sectaries Concession heighens not one whit our Certainty, whereof you may see more n. 20. In the *Interim* please to know, The only reason why I discuss this Controuersy more at Large, is; first to discover Mr Stillingsfleets gross fallacies, Next to Show that Protestants are forced at last to Put an End to Controuersies, Seeing the most Learned that euer wrote, ingenuously acknowledge the Roman Catholick Faith, to bee a safe, secure, and abundantly sufficient Means to attaine Saluation, which is to say, A true believing Catholick Cannot bee Damned vpon the Account of Wanting Faith, if other Christian Duties bee Complied with.

4. Now if you Ask what forced Sectaries to grant thus much to Catholicks? I answer it was no kindness God knows, But stark shame (to touch here on no other Motiue) which extorted the Concession from them, For would not both Heauen and earth haue Clamour'd had They damned all their own Ancestors, all the learned and ignorant of the Roman Catholick Church far and neer extended, for want of Diuine Faith? Yet this followes, Because without Faith it is impossible to please God. And thus they stand perplexed. Allow sauing faith to the Roman Catholick, Their Plea is ended; Deny it; They send millions

Disc. 1. C. 21. To Catholick, end Controuersies 219.

millions and millions of Souls to Hell. Thus much premised.  
I Argue.

5. That Faith which the Roman Catholick Church and Protestants also jointly own as sufficient to bring a man to Heauen, is intirely perfect, And cannot be rationally opposed by either Party. But the Faith of a true believing Catholick is such a Faith, Therefore it is entirely perfect, And cannot be more rationally Opposed. Now further. If it stand's thus firm vpon Church Authority (That's the certain Principle) And the Concision of Adversaries As an over-measure (though weightles) it cannot be rationally excepted against by either, both Parties owning it sufficient to Saluation. Therefore All controuersies concerning Faith are clearly ended in behalf of Catholicks; Vnless meer Can-  
tills may pass for rational Arguments.

*The Ground  
of our Doc-  
trine.*

6. It is truly Pitiful to see how vainly Mr Stillingfleet. Part. 3. C. 4. Page. 611. strues to Euert the force of this short Discourse. Sometimes The difficulty is not so much as touched by him. Sometimes Hee mistakes the Question, And euer begs it. Now He run's away with half a Principle, which lead's in a lame Conclusion. Now false Suppositions pass for Proofs. Now Protestant Opinions enter in, as sound Doctrin. Here he wrong's our Catholick Authors, There He contradict's himselfe. In a word you haue nothing through His whole fourth Chapter But I know not what strange Confusion. Thus He Begins.

*The Adversaries dis-  
course.*

7. Protestants confess there is a Possibility for some to escape (Darnation) in the Communion of the Roman Church, But it is as men may escape with their liues in Shipwrack, But they (Protestants) undertake to make it euident, There can be no danger, if they obserue the Principles of Protestant Religion. Mark first How strait hearted The man is, in granting as little as may be. viz. A meer Possibility, And of some only to be saued in the Roman Faith, hoping Thereby to remoue his own Ancestors and Millions of Pious Christians as far from Heauen as a Possibility conceiued by Him, is from an Actual Being. I know other Protestants speak more roundly And say absolutely, Saluation may be had in the Roman Catholick

E c 2

Church,



*Proved  
weak and  
unconclu-  
ding.*

Church, because it is a true Church in Fundamentals, And thus the differences between them And vs are about lesser Matters, or meer Opinions &c. See Mr. Thorndicke in his Book of *Forbearance* page 19. Therefore Mr. Stillingfleets, lean, bare, and remote Possibility of Salvation, is only his own particular Opinion. However though he see's not the Consequence, Wee haue enough to conclude against him. I'll shew you how.

8. There is, Saith he, A possibility of being Saved in the Romane Catholick Faith, That is, Catholick Religion has in it a Possibility of bringing men to Heauen, if there be nothing wanting on Their parts. Very Good. This Possibility intrinsecal To the Religion is now as actually in Being, as the Religion it Selfe, But the Religion is actually in being, Therefore this Possibility inseparable from it, is also Actual, And lies not in the Series of things yet producible, as Creatures doe which God, if he please may Create to morrow. And thus you see, Possibility stand's here not opposite to non-Existency, but to an Actual impossibility, Therefore when I say, Catholick Religion *not existing* can possibly saue All, I say with the same breath, *it cannot possibly damn Any*. Unless you'll Grant it can saue All and damn some, which is impossible.

*The Reli-  
gion which  
saves Some  
can saue all.*

9. Hence Mr. Stillingfleets pretty Put off, of Sauing *Some* and not All, is most inconsequent Doctrin; For clear the Religion from all actual essential Error, it can as-well *saue all*, as *none*. And if it be tainted with any essential Error, The whole Religion is naught, And can save none. But of this more in the next Discourse. Chap. 5. 6. where I shall proue that Catholick Religion is either intierly Good, totally Orthodox, or worth nothing, And consequently if vpon a supposed impossibility There were but one essential error in it which I through invincible ignorance know not, yet Assent to, That invincible ignorance would (Tis true) excuse me from Sin, But it cannot free the Religion from being false and forged in it self?

10. What followes in the Objection of our narrow escaping damnation in Catholick Religion, as men doe with infinit danger in

Ship

Disc 1. C. 21. To Catholicks, and Controversies 221

Shipwreck, is no more but Mr. Stilling fleets own improbable Assertion, not worth refuting, And His reason is far worse. *Our Advoc. saries im- probable Af- sertion.* Protestants, forsooth, undertake to make it evident, There can be no danger, if they observe the Principles of Protestants. To make it evident. What a vast overlash is this. Sir, make your Assertion only Morally certain, Nay, but to much as meanly probable, And May I have the honour to Answer, yo will soon disclaim Evidene. In the mean while, I look vpon it as a meer Vanity worth nothing, And so is all the rest in your next page. 612. Where you bid vs iudge, whether it be wisdom, in such a point as saluation is, to forsake a Church in which the ground of Saluation is firm, To follow a Church in which it is but possible one may be saved, but very probably he may doe worse. All this is worse than your own improbable Opinion, You here Suppose without Proof, that the ground of Saluation is firm in your Protestancy, And therefore shamfully begg the question in euery word you speak. Yet thus you go on.

11. His Lordship still asserts the Protestants way to be only the safe way to Saluation, and that in the Church of Rome, there is only a limited possibility of it. Answ. Enough is said already of the Possibility. Here you begg the question again, you run away with half a Principle, And only tell vs, what his Lordship Asserts. What security have I from his Assertion? There is yet more of this stuff. Protestants confesse, there is Saluation possible to be attained in the Romane Church; but they say with all, that the errors of that Church are so many and some so great, as weaken the foundation, that it is very hard to goe that way to Heauen, especially to them that haue had the truth manifested. Here is nothing but words. We only hear what Protestants prooflesly Thinke and Say. What am I wiser for that? These false Suppositions, This manifest begging the Question fall of Themselues without further refutation. *His glorious bragging.* *His begging the question.* *His false supposition.*

12. Were it worth the while, I might Ask whether these supposed errors so far weaken the foundation of Catholick Religion, that Saluation cannot be had in it? His Lordship Answers. I grant

222 Disc. 1. C. 21. *Protestants granting Salvation*

saluation to Romanists, But not as they are Romanists, but as They are  
 Christians And believe their Creed &c. Pitiful. Speak, plainly. Will  
 The Belief of Roman Catholick Religion damn them or no?  
 If it Damn's them, The Belief of their Creed's cannot save  
 them. (Vnless you both damn, and saue them at once) Conser-  
 rywise, if the Belief of the Creeds saues them, Roman Religion  
 cannot Damn them, for now vpon the Supposition it destroys  
 not that sauing Faith of the Creeds, But stands well with it here,  
 And therefore cannot damn any hereafter. What follows is  
 yet worse, if worse can be. You, Sr, Say. Page. 613. *My*  
*Lordship dares not deny à possibility of Saluation for the Roman Catho-*  
*lick, but he is far from Asserting it of those, who either know the*  
*corruptions of that Church, and yet continue in them, or of such who*  
*wilfully neglect the means, whereby they may be conuincid.*

13. Here is first à false Supposition for à Proof. Of *those*  
 Corruptions, And à pure begging the question besides. Here is

2. The half Principle of his Lordships bare saying laid hold on  
 without more, which inferr's no Conclusion, But only thus much,  
 That my Lord spake (and perhaps not) what he thought, Or  
 Hee did so wee Catholicks are not of so easy Faith, as to believe

*Nothing but  
 Confusion in  
 the Replies  
 of Saluaries.*

him. Here is 3. A pretty piece of Non-sense in those words  
*But he is far from Asserting it of those who know the Corruptions of*  
*that Church &c.* As, if forsooth, one truly Catholick could  
 know and own any Corruptions in his Church And yet remain  
 Catholick. These two things are inconsistent, To remain Catho-  
 lick, And to iudge *this Church corrupted* in any point of Doctrine.  
 Such men My Lord may list among his Protestant Believers.  
 In à word His Proposition is *de Subiecto non supponente*, And so is  
 also what crowd's in next, *Of Those who neglect the means offered*  
*by Protestants sufficiently Proposed &c.* Here is again the false Sup-  
 position, not proued, wee neuer yet heard of any such means, nor  
 shall here after, I am sure your Rational Account affords no  
 ne.

14. You add presently à desperate word And 'tis, *This is*  
*Lordship Speakes of such Catholicks whose meer ignorance excuseth, who*

Disc. 1. C. 21. To Catholicks End Contronersies. 223

the Fundamentals are held &c. Ergo you and your Lord damn all the learned of our Church That intierly believed the Catholick Faith for à Thousand years and vpward. You Damn our Bedes, our Bernards, our Dominicks, our Brunets, not to be listed amongst the Ignorant. You Damn more ouer all the learned Catholicks who haue liued (since your Heresy began) in Italy, Germany, Spain, France, and in other parts of the world. Bethink your self well, whether this can pass for either Catholick or Charitable Doctrin? And neuer more raile at vs vpon the account, That we Condemn you, For, for one we comdemn, you damn Thousands. Compare the ignorant, amongst you (late beginners) with the ignorant of our Church Past and present; The learned amongst you with the learned of our Church confessedly Popish for à Thousand year and vpward, There is no parallal in the number. If then you damn many, why may not we condemn the late risen fewer Multitudes amongst you, wilfully diuorced from the Mother Church. Again we damn not your Persons. No. One Supreme Iudge only, is to Pronounce the final Sentence vpon vs all, But we condemn your Heresy, And say as You ought to speak of the Arians, Pilagians, Macedonian's &c. (and all such known Renegados) That you haue no better Faith than these. Look you to the Consequences.

So Varies  
sent to Hell  
innumerable  
Learned  
men.

Catholicks  
damn none,  
but Con-  
demn Here-  
sy.

15. Your next Demand is. When we grant à possibility of Salvation to those of the Protestant Chvrch in case of inuincible Ignorance, How We dare deny it Where there is à preparation of mind, to find out and embrace the most certain Way to Heauen? What's this? Are you yet only in Preparatiues to find out, and embrace? Is one whole Age gone, And Truth not yet found out among you? The Catholick firmly belieues, A better Religion cannot be found than that is He now embraces, And you are Still in à state of seeking, and preparing for it. Sr, à meer Preparation to take Physick in à mortal infirmity cures none, no more can à Preparation to belieue, if one meet not with the right Faith, saue any. Good Physick actually applyed, cures the body, And Faith actually informing the soul saues vs.

Sollaries are  
yet preparing  
to belienue.

16. If

16. It is not now my intention to dispute that case of invincible Ignorance, great Divines favour not the Opinion. See our learned Countreiman Thomas Southwell. *Analysis fidei Diss.* 3. Cap. 9. p. 350. And Michael de Elizalde de *forma vera Religionis universalis*. Quest: 37. n. 596. The rest which followes of men being saved by The Terms of Gospel (A language I vnderstand not) And of our Stalking to the interest of the Church of Rome, is vain Talk, (euery Arian will say as much) But no close Arguing.

Our Adversary waues the main difficulty.

17. Page. 614. You offer at à Salution to our Argument already proposed. *It is most safe for Saluation to take that way which All parties agree in.* To this you neuer directly Answer, But wholly waue the difficulty, First you tell vs again without Proof of the Errours and corruptions in our Church, And say it is hard to conceiue there should be that Faith and Repentance, which you make necessary to Saluation with such à multitude of errours. So These fancied errours either destroy Diuine Faith of the Cross and Fundamentals, Or do not. If destructive of Faith, You contradict your Self, And falsify your own Proposition which saies. *Catholicks may be saved in their Religion,* For without Diuine faith no man can be saved. If these Supposed errours destroy it not, Faith (The ground of Saluation) is apt of it's own nature to produce in à Soul *Contrition, Repentance, pious Conversation, The love and loue of God &c.* Unless we wilfully hinder such holy effects of Grace. And here you haue an vnanswerable Dilemma.

A dilemma.

18. Suppose these mis-called errours destroy Faith, There is no Possibility of Saluation at all, Suppose they destroy it not but consist with it, much less can they vnroote Repentance, Piety, the loue of God, and the other virtues which bring mento Heauen. The reason is euident. Essentiall Errours, were There any, stand directly opposite to Christian Faith, which is true, therefore in the first place they must shake, or rather destroy the ground of Saluation, before they reuerse Repentance and other Christian Virtues. Now if you say we haue indeed à kind of Faith, but so defectiue that it beget's no Repentance no piety &c. You speak only your fancy, destroy the very Essence of Faith.

And Consequently the Catholick must at last be damned for want of Faith, or, if you make the-Errours so minute as not to rise out *Saving* Faith, that stands in being still, so do other Christian virtues likewise, and Saluation with them. The Argument is convincing.

19. Page. 615. You are wholly besides the Question, And fall vpon particular cases impertinent to our present purpose. You first inueigh bitterly against Death-bed Repentance, where you deliuer intolerable Doctrin. 2. You vniuſſly Calumniate, As if Catholicks taught Repentance not necessary before death, whereas the world knowes, both Doctors in Schools, and Preachers in their pulpits most Zealously inculcate the great danger of continuing in Sin, and delaying Repentance. Sr, these difficulties worth examination, And throughly Canuaſed by others, are in this place impertinencies, Therefore though you would lead me astray, yet I'll not follow you, But press you to Answer directly to the point in hand. Giue me à man, For example, An humble St. Francis, who liued euer à Penitential life, and delayed not Repentance vntil death (there haue been innumerable in the Church profoundly humble and penitential) the Question is, whether you dare damn such vpon the Account of wanting true Faith, true Repentance, the fear or love of God &c? Damn such. And you deny the possibility of Saluation to all Catholicks; Save them, And you grant that true Repentance, piety and other Christian virtues are consistent with Catholick Faith. And thus I renoue you from your particular case of Death-bed repentance; For although all such were Damned (which is hideously impious to Assert) Yet you see our Question has à large extent in order to millions of other Belieuers, who liued piously all their life long. Now if you Say that Doctrin which holds Saluation possible to one who euer liued à lewed life, and only repent's at death is perniciously impious, you only vent your Opinion, And here is an other impertinency.

20. Page. 617. You come to that which is the proper business, And t'is to examin the strength of our Inferences.

Ff

Protestants

Our Adversaries impertinencies.



## 216 Dis. 1. C. 21. Protestants granting Salvation

*This Instance  
brought in.*

Protestants grant we may be saved, And the Church asserts it also. To this you say his Lordship return's a triple Answer, Who first begins with the confession of Protestants. This was the way of the Donatists of old, which would hold as well for Them, as the Church of Rome. To prove the Assertion you instance in one particular of Baptism. Both Catholicks and Donatists granted Baptism was true among the Donatists, but the Donatists denied it to be true Baptism among the Catholick Christians, Therefore on this Principle the Donatists side is the surer side, if the Principle be true. It is the safest taking that way, which the differing Parties agree on. Answer. 1. Here is no Agreement concerning the main point of Salvation, For the Catholicks and Donatists jointly and unanimously neuer openly Confessed that Catholicks could be saved, as now we and Protestants by one consent say it. But let that pass. 2. The Catholicks and Donatists agreed that Baptism administred by Hereticks was valid and good. That's true Doctrin. But both parties neuer agreed, that it was lawful for a Catechumen to take Baptism from the Donatists, vnless in Case of necessity. See *Augustin* Lib. 1. de Bapt. c. 2. 3. O, but thus much follows. The Donatists Baptism is more safe than that of Catholicks vpon this Principle, That both Parties agree'd so far, and it is safest to take that way wherein differing Parties agree, consequently the Catholicks Baptism is less safe, because the Donatists denied it to be true.

*To no purpose.*

*A Paralogism  
gism answered.*

*The Fundamental  
ground of  
our Answer.*

21. Answer: This whole Discourse is a meer Paralogism; the Fallacy lies here, That the Opinion of dissenting men is supposed to Add more security, more certainty to Church-Doctrin, than the Doctrin it self deriues from that Oracle of Truth. I say Contrary. As such Opinions, when true, Add no more weight or certainty to that Doctrin than it had antecedently from the Church, So if false; They make not the Doctrin less certain. Take one instance, God reueals this Truth. *The Divines did assumed Humane nature.* One preaches the Truth but Adds no degree of certainty to the Doctrin in it self, which in the highest degree was most certain, before his Preaching. An other fallacy

Disc. 1. C. 21. To *Catholicks, and Contronersies.* 227

(as Arius did) opposes the verity, it is not Therefore less certain in it self because He contradicts it. And thus we discourse of our Church Tenets, indubitably most certain vpon Church Authority, whether Hereticks *deny* or *grant*, (That Matters not) the Doctrin stand's firm still as before, And as we see by daily experience neither riseth higher in certainty, nor fall's lower in the iudgement of Catholicks, because Sectaries side with it, or bend against it.

22. Thus much proued The Paralogism is at an end. The Catholicks held The Donatists Baptism valid; so they would haue done had these Hereticks duely Ministred it, and with all (which is possible) afterward denied it valid, So independent Church Doctrin is of dissenting mens opinions. The Donatists again slighted our Catholick Baptism, the Church regards it not, For as the Opinions of the Goodnes of their own Baptism beighned not the Churches certainty concerning it, So their Contrary Opinion of its insufficiency made not the Truth less certain to the Catholick. Apply what is here noted to our present case, and you will see the like Conclusion. Protestants Say, we may be saved in Catholick Religion. The Opinion is true, But as asserted by them is no more but an Opinion, which therefore Adds not one grain of more Certainty to Catholick Doctrin, For had they denied vs a possibility of Saluation, as now by meer Chance they grant it, Catholicks would haue given as little eare to That, as They now doe to their many other false Opinions. So it is? Church Doctrin as I now said, neither fall's nor riseth in certainty, vpon the account of our Sectaries Opinions.

23. You will Ask what then gain we by the Concession of Protestants when it giues vs no more Assurance in this particular, than we had before from the Church? I haue answered aboue. We gain thus much, That they cannot rationally impugn any Catholick Doctrin without contradicting Them selues, For if confessedly, This bring's men to Heauen, the Religion is sound, And implies no essential Errour, The concession then, as I said, serues well as an Argument *ad Hominem* to stop the mouths of

*Sectaries Si-  
ding with  
vs neither  
Lessens nor  
increases  
our Certain-  
ty.*

248. Disc. 1. C. 21. Protestants granting Salvation

What their  
Excession  
Serves for?

Sectaries, And shoves withall, That they end controuersies For us  
horridly vniust to dispute against à Faith which all grant saues  
souls. We pretend no more, nor can pretend it, And here is the  
Reason.

23. No Catholick (nor indeed any other) doth or can believe  
à Christian Verity vpon this ground or Motiue, that Sectaries say  
its true, for their saying so, is neither Gods Reuelation nor the  
Churches Doctrin, But à meer Opinion as taught by them, But an  
opinion (chiefly theirs) is to weak to ground any faith vpon, There-  
fore if I believe, as I do, Salvation most safe in the Roman Catho-  
lick Church, I believe it vpon à Motiue totally distinct from the  
Protestants Assertion. It is true, their Assertion or siding with  
vs may induce one to reflect on the great power Truth has in  
working vpon men most refractory, Though it Adds no new  
degree of certainty to Catholick Doctrin. I haue insisted lon-  
ger vpon this point because it vtterly destroies what euer Mr. Sil-  
lingfleet can say against vs, vnless he will quarrel vpon this score,  
that I here suppose my Church Doctrin most certain, which  
is not the Question now, But may well be supposed in all good  
law of disputation, And shall, God willing, be proued in the next  
Discourse.

The Secta-  
ries Argu-  
ment taken  
from the  
Eucharist,

24. Page. 619. you proceed to à second Answer of his  
Lordship, And Argue thus. If that be the safest which both  
Parties agree in, the Principle makes much for the Advantage of  
Protestants, And why? We Catholicks are bound, Say you, to  
believe with you in the Point of the Eucharist, For all sides agree  
in the faith of the Church of England, That in the most blessed sa-  
crament the worthy Receiver is by his Faith made Spiritually partaker  
of the true and Real body and blood of Christ, truly and really &c.  
Answ. 1<sup>o</sup>. If we believed As you do, The motiue of our Faith  
would be, As is now said, quite different from the Motiue of  
your Opinion, And so it is *de falso* in the belief of euery Catho-  
lick Mystery. But I waue this, And say Your Principle is ill  
applied, For you and we agree in iust nothing concerning the  
Eucharist, but thus far only, That what we see look's like bread.

We

Disc. 1. C. 21. To Catholicks, end Controversies. 229

We say that very Christ who was born of the Virgin, and suffered on the Cross is really and substantially present vnder the form's of bread after true Consecration, You by a strange fancy lay hold of Christs Presence existing in Heauen, And think thereby to make your selues partaker of his real body. We say Christ is really and really in two, and more places at once, you make this vtterly impossible. We put the real Presence or local being of Christ in the very Object before our eyes vpon the Altar, you put it in your faith, or Fancy rather. Hence your questiour afterward viz. *Whether we do not allow any real and Spiritual presence of Christ besides the Corporal* (you mean the Real) manducation, is soon answered, For we distinguish what you confound together, And say, if by these Terms *Spiritual Presence* you would exclude the *real obiectiue Presence* of Christs sacred body, we dissent from you, And absolutely hold that Real obiectiue Presence, which may be rightly called *spiritual* because by it Christ is placed *Totus in toto, totally in the whole host and totally in euery part of it.* Contrariwise, if you make it only a fancied Presence of Christ, or say, Hee is not really vnder the Forms or Accidents of bread, wee leaue that lean Sacramentarie Doctrin to you, vtterly disauow it, and still dissent from you.

Worth noting, and why?

25. The whole cheat lies hudled vp in those vnexplicated words. *The worthy Receiver is by his Faith made spiritually partaker of the true and real body.* &c. As if, forsooth, your two terms, *Faith, and Spiritual*, could make vs agree in one Tenet, whereas we most vary about this very *Faith* and the *object* of it, And also disclaime your fancied *Spiritual Presence.* Hence we say, you haue neither true Sacrament, nor true Faith, nor receiue worthily, nor really partake of Christs true body, nor of any benefit of his Passion. We say you feed not spiritually, but only tast natural bread. This is our Doctrin concerning your miscalled Eucharist, we allow you no more, and Therefore vtterly dissent from you.

The fallacy discovered,

26. You add presently a great vntruth, And I wonder you could speak it without blushing. *The greatest men of our Perswa-*

# 230 Disc. 1. C. 21. Protestants granting Salvation

tion as Suarez and Bellarmine (say you) assert the belief of Transubstantiation not to be simply necessary to Salvation. Ignorance or, Malice or both had certainly à hand here, For they say no such thing, I Ascribe much to the first, moved thereunto by your following words. And that the Manner of it is secret and ineffable. Dear Sir, were Christ really present without Transubstantiation as Luther held. The manner of his existing with bread might yet be secret and ineffable, But would this interr à denial of his ineffable Presence. All that Catholick Authors say, is, That the *modus existendi* or Manner of his existing in the Sacrament, is secret and ineffable even with Transubstantiation; do they Therefore hold the verity not simply necessary to Salvation, or boggle at the Doctrine of Transubstantiation? You belieue à Trinity of Persons in one Divine Essence, it's hard for you to expresse the Manner how God is one, and three distinct Persons, yet you belieue the Mystery And hold that belief necessary to Salvation. Divines endeavour to explicate the Manner of Christs ineffable Presence in the Eucharist, but when all is done you have no more from Them but Opinions, And so it fall's out in the other Mystery of the Trinity, where Schoolmen vary in their explicating *Quomodo*, How God can be one in Essence And three distinct Persons, Yet they hold the belief of the Mystery after à due Proposal absolutely necessary to Salvation, And thus they discourse of Christs ineffable Presence in the Eucharist. The *Quomodo*, or Manner of his Being there is difficult And cannot be clearly laid forth to weak Reason; yet that perplexeth not our Faith whereby wee submissively yeild to what God speakes without further curiosity.

27. Your other instances. Page. 626. are quite besides the business. Christ you say, instituted the Sacrament in both kinds, The Primitiue Christians receiued in both. What then? by Christ commanded both to laicks, is no Consequence, nor agreed on by Catholicks. 2. Both Churches, say you, Agree that the Eucharist is à Sacrifice of duty, of Praise, of Commemoration &c. You know, we absolutely deny your Snpposition, and say you have no true Sacrifice, consequently neither praise God, nor Com-

memorate

Our Adversaries Min Hake,

Other instances refused.

Disc 1. C. 21. To Catholicks, end Controversies. 171

memorate Christs Passion, but grievously offend him in your taking  
à bare piece of bread, Here is no Agreement. And thus we speak  
of your Mass or Liturgy, For there was neuer Mass in the  
without à true Sacrifice, you haue no Sacrifice, Ergo no Mass  
Church. The grossest error therefore is that you haue raised  
out the Sacrifice, most essential to à Liturgy.

28. Page, 621. You say. His Lordship Answers truly,  
that the Agreement of differing parties is no Metaphysical Principle, *The Contingent proposition.*  
but à bare contingent Proposition Which may be true or false, as the  
matter is, to which it is applied. Answ. A contingent Proposition;  
What's this Sr? If you mean that the Protestant party vented it  
by chance, I'll not quarrel with you, But our it is in print, And  
applied to the Possibility of Salvation, which you allow Catho-  
licks. Let this concession stand, it cannot but be true vnless  
you say, Both parties err in the Assertion, And then we are not  
only out of the Question, but highly blame you vpon this account,  
That all your pains in discussing so largely the matter hitherto, has  
been to no purpose, For one line might haue ended All, had you  
plainly Said. *We Protestants souly erred when we granted Salvation to*  
*Catholicks in their own Religion.* Be it how you will. I say this  
Proposition. *Saluation may be had in Catholick Religion,* is So true,  
that it cannot be false, because the greatest Authority on earth, the  
vniuersal Church of Christ own's it as an vndoubted verity, and  
could this possibly be à falshood, neither we nor Protestants can  
believe any thing which the Church teaches, as is amply proued  
in the second Discourse. &c. For to what purpose should I be-  
lieue the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Creed or any thing els, when  
that Church which proclaims these as Truths, may after all damne  
me? The very ugliness of such à thought carries horror with it,  
And stark shame decries it, as Abominable. Your Lord and  
you say next. *The consent of disagreeing parties is neither Rule nor proof*  
*of truth, No man can resoluè his Faith into it, but Truth rather is, or*  
*should be the Rule to frame, if not to force Agreement.* Answ. All this  
is very right; Therefore we neuer make your consent either Rule  
or proof of any Catholick Verity, much less do wee resoluè our  
Faith

*Inferre  
that it can  
make false.*



232 Disc. 1. C. 20. Protestants granting Salvation.

Faith into your Agreement; Church Doctrin Stands firm without you, it was true before you were in being; And the evidence of it forced you to consent with vs. Now a word to your other two or three instances. And.

*Other In-  
stances pro-  
and weight  
less.*

29. In real truth, Sr, I much wonder you saw not their Lame-  
ness, before you thrust them into your Page 621. And that  
you would fain allow them Strength to weaken this Truth. *We  
and Protestants Agree thus far that Catholick Religion can save vs, etc.*  
I say Contrary, The instances are so remote from your design,  
That they proue just nothing. One is. *The Orthodox Christians  
agreed with the Arians, that Christ was of like nature with his Fa-  
ther, But added, Hee was of the same nature, Ergo, Say you, it  
is safest to hold with the Arians.* To hold what I beseech you? You  
Answer, that Christ was of the like nature. Very good. *The  
Likeness* either excluded the *same nature* or included it; Grant the  
first, you make the Fathers Hereticks, which is impossible, For  
they held the *same nature common* and *Consubstantial* to the Fa-  
ther and Son. If their concession (which is true) included the  
*same nature*, The Orthodox party and Arians agreed, not in the  
*same hypothesis*, consequently your instance is to no purpose at  
all. In a word this euer and vnexceptionably holds good. The  
Doctrin which Hereticks Iewes and Turks agree in with Catho-  
licks is most true (so you and we agree about saluation now dis-  
cussed) but it doth not follow, that so much *only*, or that *no more  
is true*. Your want of reflecting vpon this *Only* or, *no More* makes  
all your instances impertinent And your inferences *Ergo*, *It is sa-  
fest holding with the Arians* most vnconcluding; For though the  
Doctrin be true when the *Arian* side with the Church, yet it de-  
rives no absolute safety from that consent of Hereticks.

*That's truth  
wherein  
Catholicks  
and Here-  
ticks agree.*

30. Vpon these grounds all the rest which followes falls to  
nothing. *Some dissenting parties* (Say you) agree that there ought  
to be a Resurrection from Sin, and that this Resurrection is meant in di-  
vers passages of Scripture, But they deny the Resurrection of the body after  
Death. Ergo it will be the Safest to deny the article of the Resurrection.  
Again: Dissenting parties, as Iewes, Turks, and Sectaries agree with  
Catho-

Disc. 1. C. 21. To Catholicks, end Controversies. 233

Catholicks, that there is but one God, Ergo by virtue of this Principle, we will be bound to deny the Trinity. Lastly. Dissembling parties Agree fully with vs That Christ is man; but Hereticks deny His Godhead. Therefore it will be safest believing that Christ is meer man, And not God.

Answer. With much wearisomness do I read these more than pitiful improbable inferences. Not one of them arises from Premises which lead in any thing like your Conclusion. Reduce but

one to right Form (one serves for all) and you will see your folly. Thus it is. That Doctrine in which Catholicks and Hereticks agree is safe and true Doctrine; Catholicks and Hereticks agree in this Doctrine that Christ is man (but not man only) ergo that is safe and true Doctrine. Here is the utmost your Premises can infer, And I grant

Premises put  
which infer  
no Conclusion.

all. Christ is truly man. So I grant the Doctrine of a Resurrection from sin, of one God only to be most sound and Catholick, But here is your grand mistake and open fallacy with it. You seem to persuade the Reader, that because Hereticks agree so far with the Church, Therefore it is safe to deny what ever other Doctrine she maintains. Sr, She maintains the Truths now mentioned, yet not only Those But many more And herein there is no Agreement, consequently no good conclusion for you upon any

opened Principle. For thus much only follows from thence, That so far as we Agree, so far true Doctrine is taught. Apply this to our present matter and all is plain. You and we agree thus far, that

Salvation may be had in the Roman Catholick Religion. Most true. We dissent from you concerning the Charge of Superstitions and gross Errours imposed on vs, from this you can infer

An other  
fallacy discovered.

no Conclusion against vs upon the Principle of Agreement, now Supposed in the other Doctrine of Salvation, which goes on soundly without all contradiction. I would say. We agree about Salvation and that's a Truth; we differ in other points, here we must dispute upon other Grounds, And lay that agreed on Principle aside,

for immediately it leads in no conclusion in such matters.

31. Shall I now tell you where your whole Fallacy lies? It lurks in that pretty Term, *Safest*, For you thought to *infect* into it this Sense. So much Doctrine as we and Hereticks agree in is only

G g

is only

## 234 Disc. I. C. 10. Protestants granting Salvation.

*The Principle of Agreement abused*

is only the *Safest*, But no more, As if we Catholicks held, where another Tenet is out of the compass of that agreed-on Doctrin implies both *Vnsafety* and *Vncertainty*. You grossly mistake. We hold euery other Point of Catholick Religion wherein you and we dissent wholly as Safe and certain, as That is we both agree in; For I tell you once more, our *Safety* and *certainity* depend vpon any Hereticks consent. If then you would rack That Principle (We and Arians agree) to this untoward sense, So much Doctrin precisely is the safest we agree in, And no more, Or, That our maintaining that agreed-on Doctrin to be safe, excludes other Catholick verities from being So, Wee neither agree with the Arian nor any other Heterodox, But utterly disclaim The Principle and consequently say, you can draw no Conclusion at all from it against vs. Sense the Principle and all is clear. Hereticks and we agree, That Christ is man, That sense contains certain Doctrin. O, but the meaning may be; He is so purely man that he is not God. Giue it this sense, we agree not, but reject the Principle as Heretical, which therefore inferr's nothing like à conclusion against vs. All is contrary in the other agreed on Principle Concerning the Saluation of Catholicks, For that as I said now, Though it serue not immediatly to end other debates, touching Purgatory, Praying to Saints &c. yet it drawen with it à long train of notable consequences. For if we may be lined, we haue true Faith in our Church, true Hope, true Charity, true Repentance, And what euer is necessary to attain salvation.

### *More of Mr. Stillingfleets Mistakes briefly discovered.*

32. I'll only briefly hint all the rest which followes from your Page 623. to the end of the Chapter, To touch them is enough to take off the little strength they haue. You ask first. *Why you ought to believe that Which both Parties agree in.* I Answer because you

Disc. 1. C. 21. To Catholicks, end Controuersies. 235

you must belieue in some Church, which is either your own or the Romam Catholick Or Both, Both grant the Catholick may be saued, what would you haue more. You Ask again, *If the consenting parties may agree in à falshood What euidence haue you but that the agreed on Principle, is one of those Falshoods?* I haue answered. 1. If the Principle, bee supposed false you might haue roundly said so at the beginning, and spared all your superfluous labour spent to no purpose in this fourth Chapter. I Answered, 2. The true Church, euen when Protestants consent to it cannot Agree in à falshood, for the true Church speaks truth, And He or They who side with it cannot swerue from truth in that. You say. 3. It ought to be à safe Principle indeed, and no vncertain Topical Argument, which men should venture their souls vpon. Answ. If men must be saued in the true Church (be it yet where you will) And in this we All agree, none can in conscience call the Doctrin of it Topical or vncertain, as shall be proued afterward. In the mean while Say I beseech you, what safer Principle haue you to rely on in this weighty matter of Saluation, which will not be more Topical Than that is which the true Church teaches, And you approue. You know, or should know there was neuer any true Church since Christianity began, which denied Saluation to the Romam Catholick. Nay all Orthodox Christians euer granted it. You side with all these Orthodox Christians and what greater Authority can there be on earth? Yet this Principle must be called by you *Topical and vncertain*. Say then what's more certain? Will you leaue the voice and vote of all Orthodox Professors and run to Scripture? Alas, The whole book Saith no where so much as seemingly, That you Protestants are in the *Safe Way of Saluation*, And we Catholicks not. What euer Argument therefore is drawn from Scripture, will be à lesse satisfactory Principle (yea none at all) And infinitely more Topical in order to *saue you*, Than what the church teaches, and you hold with it, is, *so saue vs*. Now if you let goe this Principle of plain Scripture, as you must (or I'll vrge you to produce that plain Text which *saues you*,

*Two questions answered.*

*Church Doctrin Mis-called Topical.*

236 Disc. 1. C. 21. Protestants granting Salvation

you, and *Damn's* Catholicks) you have nothing left to stand on but meer Misinterpretations and Glosses, which indeed merit not so much as very name of *Topicks*.

*Answer to  
an Objection  
taken from  
Heathenism*

33. You say 4. Heathenism if our Principle hold, will be proued the safest way to Salvation, For some of you (Catholicks) agree That many of them may be saued without any explicate knowledge had of Christ, But they deny you can be saued by it. Answer Here the old fallacy is on foot again, And a pretty Antilogy with it, For if the Heathens deny we can be saued by an explicate knowledge of Christ, They must certainly haue some explicate knowledge of him; Or if they haue no such explicate knowledge, How can they deny Salvation to vs by Christ? They cannot deny what they neuer heard off. But let this pass. I Answer. 2. You are quite besides the Question and once more out of our Principle, For you ioine together two opinions only. viz. what the Heathens and some Catholicks hold in order to the Salvation of such Aliens. And We in the contest with you, make vse of a Doctrin which all the Orthodox Churches on earth haue euer taught: This is more certain than any opinion can be, and only (in order to the inference about the Salvation of Catholicks) Add your opinion to it. 3. After you haue said all, you only conclude thus much, that a Heathen may be saued without any explicate knowledge of Christ. The Concession so far is good vpon the Opinion of Catholick Doctors, but doth it follow from hence that so much only is true, or that no more Doctrin is Safe? This you ought to infer or you proue nothing.

*Sollersius  
owns Catho-  
licks à part  
of the Ca-  
tholick*

34. Page. 623. You only tell vs what his Lordship saies. viz. That the Roman Church, and the Church of England are but two distinct members of the Catholick Church, spread ouer the face of the earth. Obserue good Reader, our Adversaries both here and there where often make vs à part, at least, of the Church Catholick. Vpon that Concession I argue ad Hominem, they are certainly to talk no more of any danger of damnation for want of Faith, but grant freely we may be saued, or in real Truth They suspect Mahomet in malice. For if Mahomet who held Moses and Christ

Disc. 1. C. 21. To Catholicks, end Controversies. 237

Christ two great Prophets neuer dared to damn those millions of souls that beliened in them, And had liued from Moses vntil the wicked man set forth his Alcoran, much less can these men who hold vs Christians, and part of the Catholick Church damn those innumerable professors of this great moral body for want of Faith, who haue been since the 4. or 6. age vntil Luther appeared in the world. You next put vs to our proofs. If we can proue that the Roman Church is properly the Catholick Church it self, we are to speak out &c. Sr, though we are not to proue that we keep in the Kings high way where the world has seen vs so many Ages, But might most iustly force you (late straglers) to proue you haue taken à better path; Yet what you desire is so amply euinced in the other Treatise vpon seuerall Occasions chiefly Disc. 3. C. 1. 2. 3. That none of you hitherto haue dared to Answer. The proof briefly is reduced to this plain Discourse. Three dayes before Luther shamefully deserted the Roman Catholick Communion, there was à true visible Church on earth, but that only was the Roman Catholick Church for all other Societies, name which you will, were erroneous and heretical. Ergo the Roman Church, or none, (for Protestants were not then in the world) was the true Faithful Orthodox Church of Christ, And is so Still after our Sectaries late Revolt from it.

Mahomet  
more fanatical  
then  
Sectaries.

The Roman,  
the only  
Catholick  
Church,

35. You Cloy our ears again with his Lordships seuerer Sentence concerning the Leaders of our Church, who refuse to hear, Her Instruction, And his Charity extend's so far as to think them all lost souls, though many that succeed them in those Errors, without obstinacy, may be saved. Answ: His Lordship neither is, nor was, nor Shall ener be the Iudge of the liuing and the Dead, Therefore we little heed his heavy Doom, The man has his already. But say I beseech you? Where was the Church before Luther whose Instruction the Catholick Leaders refused to hear? was it your English Church? Alas, it was à thing, neuer heard of in those Dayes. Was it the Church of Ariens, Pelagians, and such like condemned Hereticks, must our Leaders be damned for



## 238. Disc. 1. C. 21. Protestants granting Salvation

*A question  
Proposed  
Concerning  
The Church  
Catholick?*

not hearing these? No certainly. Say then for Gods sake where was the Church; they should haue haue harken'd to and refused to hear? Here, Sr, we vrge you, may we vse your own Phrase to *speake out, to pronounce, and proue.* Again. How dare you with any Conscience suppose, that so many learned, most pious and virtuous *Prelates, Pastors, Doctors,* Religious, went against their own Consciences to lead Themselves and millions of Souls into Perdition? whereof innumerable gaue all they had to the poor, some built Churches; Others founded Monasteries, others Vniuersities, Others, who might haue liued like Princes in the world, shut themselves vp in Cells to gain Heauen at last, yet these, for sooth, must be Misleaders with you, And damn themselves and whole Millions for nothing. The Diuel in Hell hath not malice enough to harbour such à thought, And I verily perswade my self that neither the Bishop that's gone, nor you, Sr, when you wrote your *Account*, where so far infatuated, as to Iudge it probable. Your Papers speake not alwaies your own Consciences.

*Desperate  
Doctrin.*

*A most  
impertinency*

36. You Still run on with nothing. *Many*, Say you, *hold the Foundation it self Doctrinally, who hold it not sauinely.* Most true. But the fault is not in the Doctrin, but in their want of complying. And what's this to our present purpose? whilst we only Assert with you That Catholick Religion can saue vs, If our liues be answerable to it.

37. You say again Page. 624. Our Leaders are lost because they most dangerously Withhold from others the plain and vndoubted Word of God, And therefore deserue the same Anathema which. *S. Paul* Pronounces against an Angel, in case he teach any other Doctrin. Answ. Do you speake in earnest Good Sr? Fauour me so far, That you and I may debate this one point, and end it by plain Scripture, If you show me vpon sound Principles indeed, That we teach any Doctrin Contrary to the plain word of God I am gained to your side, And shall acknowledge you Conquerour, But no fear of this. You Say moreouer, if you Proue vs guilty of any gross dangerous and damnable Error, That, will be abundantly sufficient to

Disc. 1. C. 21. To Catholicks, end Controuersies. 239

*your purpose, that Our's cannot possibly be any safe way to saluation.*  
Answ. Very right indeed. But these *if* end no Controuersies:  
Set, once more pen paper and proue vs guilty of damnable Er-  
roure, and you'll damn so many, that very few of your Protestants  
will be left in a state of Saluation. I'll make the Assertion good  
hereafter. In the *interim* you Tell vs, *Wee palpably beg the Question*  
*whilst we suppose the whole Church is on our side, and against you, which*  
*is a notorious falshood.* Sr, words are but wind. I shall by the  
Grace of God Euidence this Truth so notoriously in the next  
Discourse, that you, if reason may haue place, must confess, Ca-  
tholicks are the only Orthodox Church, And Consequently grant,  
that Controuersies are ended between vs.

*Conditional*  
*Propositions,*  
*here insigni-*  
*ficant.*



THE

THE  
SECOND DISCOURSE  
OF

*The Church and Rule of Faith*

**H**ERE wee come to handle a main Matter in Controuersies, And first Euidenceth the true Church by Her Marks and Glorious Miracles. The Roman Catholick Church is proued the only Orthodox Society of Christians, and Rule of Faith also. V Vee Euince Her absolute Infallibility, and shew by Reason, That if She hath taught but one false Doctrin, and obliged Christians to belieue it, there is now no true Faith in the world.

CHAP. I.

Necessary Principles premised relating to the Controversy now in hand, concerning the true Church  
And Rule of Faith.

**T**HIS first Principle. God whose eternal designe is to bring man to true Faith in this short pilgrimage, and after to endles Happines, afford's means to acquire both, And hath as well laid open the means whereby true Faith may be attained, As made our final End known. *Principles presupposed.*

2. The second-Principle. Those want the means leading to the last happy End, who are Aliens from the true Church of Christ, or Separated from that Catholick Society. The Assertion is so plainly deliuered not only by most Ancient Fathers, But by the more learned Sectaries also, That it is needles to produce many Testimonies. S. Cyprian. *Lib. de unitate Ecclesie* Saith. *Quisquis ab Ecclesia separatus est &c.* Who euer is separated from the Church is ioyned to an Adulteress, And diuorced from all the Promisses of the Church. *He comes not to the reward, which Christ has promised who leaues the Church of Christ. He is an Alien, Treacher an Enemy, and cannot haue God for his Father, who hath not the Church for his Mother.* S. Austin. *lib. 4. de Symb. C. 13.* Speaks fully this sense Citing those last words of Cyprian. And *Lib. 4. de Baptis. C. 17.* Saith. Out of the Church there is no Salvation. Yet more; *Epist. 151.* Who euer is or shall be separated from the Catholick Church, although he thinks himself to live most laudably, For this one wickednes alone, that he is disioyned from the unity of Christ, shall haue no life, *Sed ira Dei manet super eum*, But the wrath of God remains vpon him. S. Fulgentius *Lib. de*

*The Fathers Testimonies produced.*

Hh

side

242 Disc. 2. C. 1. Principles premised relating

*fidem ad Petrum, C. 39.* Hold this most certain and no way doubt of it, That an Heretick or Schismatick baptized in the name of the Father of the Son and Holy Ghost, if he be not in Union with the Catholick Church, Although he giues neuer so great Alms; And shed his blood for Christ, yet he cannot be saved. I waue other excellent Authorities known to euery one versed in the Fathers, And need not to take more pains when Protestants themselues own the Doctrin. The Ark was a type of the Church, saith Perkins, in symb. Colum: With mr. 781. *extra quam omnes interibant*, out of which Ark All dyed, and all are damned who are out of the Church. Again In *Caput. 9. ad Galat.* Those who are not members of the visible Church, are not members of the Catholick Church. Humfred. *Ad Roman. 1. Campiani.* We condemn all who are not aggregated to the visible Church of God. Finally Calvin, the Master of Sectaries. *Lib. 4. Instit. C. 1. 4.* makes it absolutely necessary to be in union with Christs visible Church.

Sectaries  
Consent.

The Ground  
of our Ca-  
tholick  
Truth

Vnity and  
Diuision in  
Faith haue  
no place in  
the true  
Church.

2. The ground of this Truth is so solidly laid down in Scripture, that none can contradict it, For here the Church is called the Kingdom, the Body, the Inheritance of Christ, purchased at a dear rate, the effusion of his sacred blood, A City built vpon a Mountain. The House, the Temple of God, the Hierusalem, the Pillar and firmament of Faith, &c. Whereby it appears, That whoeuer is out of this Kingdom, out of this City, out of this house and Temple of God; whoeuer is not a member of this Mystical body or shares not in this purchased Inheritance, or in a word out of the true Church (be it where you will, I yet define nothing) is in a damnable condition. A sad thought for all Sectaries, because it is certain, that Christ has not composed his Church of such Members as rightly belieue the reuealed Doctrin taught by the true Church, and of such as oppose it. Vnity and Diuision in points of Faith are inconsistent in the same Orthodox Church, and destroy the essential forme of it, which is one Faith. Now if our Adversaries talk of a vnity in Fundamentals, they are not only evidently conuincied of Error in the other Treatise, But vpon this very Account become Separaters from the Church.

and without Principles Assert that which neither Church nor Scripture teaches. *Who euer hold's not the Catholick faith entire shall Perish eternally*, saith S. Athanasius in his Creed, but an entire Belief excludes all distinction between fundamentals and others, as is manifest. I little value some Protestants Glosses made vpon this Text, for Glosses with me are weightles, when they stand vnprincipled.

4. The 3. Principle. What the true Church of Christ teaches concerning the sense of Scripture, That's the sense intended by the Holy Ghost, and Consequently most true. The reason is. *Truth cannot be contrary to truth*, The Church and Scripture neuer Clash, But alwaies speak one and the same verity. This Sectaries must grant, who define the Church to be an *Assembly of men professing the pure Word of God*, Therefore it cannot deceive or teach an Error contrary to that pure Word, Or if it doth so, it conuicteth, as ipso, to be Gods Oracle, And the true Church of Christ.

5. If these men still go on trifling with their wonted distinction, of Fundamentals, and not Fundamentals, And allow a Perfect vnity of Doctrine between the Church and Scripture in things absolutely necessary to Salvation, but not in others. This is to define, and not to define, to build and destroy, to teach and cheat in one breath, For a definition, which makes known the nature of a Thing, must stand in its open sense without restraint, and exactly agree to the thing defined. Mark now. Christs true Church is the *Thing defined*; and the Definition charged with endless restrictive Terms, is drawn to Nott-sense, for it tells vs, the Church is an Assembly of men professing the pure Word of God, But how far? In a few simple Truths, called fundamentals, in others it may err, and profess as much falshood as you please *against the Verities of Scripture*, So that the true Church, not defined at all, is made by these, a fair and foul Spouse at once, fair in a few vnalterable necessary Truths, but foul, vgly, and deformed (because erroneous) in a hundred other matters. Mark the Paradox, and call it a flat Heresy, which separat's him who assert's it from the Catholick body. Thus it is. Christs Church is true,

*The Distinction between Fundamentals and others, frivolous.*



244 Disc 2. C. 1. Principles premised relating

and false, pure and vnpure, right and wrong, louely and hateful together. The Inhabitants of this City of God, of this Temple and safe dwelling place, are in it by belieuing à few simple Truths, And at the same time out of it, by belieuing more Falsities. This is Mr Stillingfleets strange Doctrin, who think there is no Church now in the world of one Denomination free from Errour. To what desperate improbabilities doth Heresy driue men?

Church  
Doctrin  
clear in the  
Churches  
Definitions.

Not alwaies  
so inscrip-  
tions, as Seba-  
stians grant.

6. The 4. Principle. The receiued Doctrin of Christs Church, chiefly in all points of Controuersy is euer as clear, and often more clear, by what She teaches, than it is in any express words of Scripture. The Assertion is vndubitable. For who see's not, but that the whole Catholick Doctrin, of the sacred Trinity, of one God and three distinct Persons, of the Father improduced, the eternal Son begotten, and of the Holy Ghost proceeding from both, is more plainly deliuered in Church Doctrin, than in any sentence, or sentences of Holy Writ. The like I say of the high Godhead in Christ, which the Arians deny, Of Original sin, reiected by the Pelagians, and other Articles of our Christian faith. And thus much is euident against Sectaries, for do not they make their own Doctrin, of their Case or Sacrament, when they call it à Sign, à Figure &c. more plain than any words are for it, in Holy writ? And will they not also grant (Tis an Argument ad hominem) that our Catholick Tenet of this sacred Mystery, laid forth in the Council of Trent. *Can. 13. Can. 1.* is more express and plain Popery than lies couched in Christs own words *This is my body*, Though the Popery is there clear enough to euery Reader? Yes most assuredly, For if our Doctrin stand as plain in Christs words, as in the Churches Definition drawn from thence, Sectaries cannot (as they do) admit of the one and scornfully reiect the other. Therefore they must suppose Scripture more dark and obscure, than either their own, or our Churches Doctrin is. And hence it followes that the very Arians were not so much Hereticks vpon the account, that they opposed any most clear and express sentence

sentence in Holy writ (for really it's hard to find one manifestly against them), as for contradicting plain Church Doctrine, or the true sense of Scripture deliuered by this Oracle of truth, Their Heresy then proceeded first from some words in Scripture seemingly clear in their behalf, as, *My Father is greater than I*, 2. From no Text so manifest, but that still place was left them to Glosse as they haue done, and in their Iudgements with some appearance of truth, yet Hereticks they were and so deseru'dly accounted of, for contradicting the Church's clear Doctrine. Be it how you will, thus much I am sure of, They neuer mangled or misused any passage in holy Writ, when contrary to their Heresy more shamefully, than our Protestants now mangle and abuse our Saviours Proposition. *This is my body*.

*Why the  
Arians were  
accounted  
Heretiques.*

7. By all you see this Principle well grounded. *Whatever Clarity Scripture hath chiefly in Matters of controversy* (and clarity helps much in the Rule of Faith) *Gods true Church, which cannot but speak the Scriptures sense, in every particular, deliueris it most clearly*, Wherefore S. Austin told Manicheus, *Tom: 6. contra Epist: Fundam. C. 14.* That if hee was to belieue the obscure Mysteries of Christianity, Hee would assent to them vpon the weighty Authority of People and Nations celebrated and spread abroad, By the consent of all learned, and vnlearned, which consent implies the vniuersal Agreement of the Catholick Church, And to establish this Doctrine more firmly, He assures vs. *Tract. 18. in Ioan:* That all Heresy which intangles souls and cast's them into Hell, proceed's from this one misery, that *Good Scripture* is not rightly vnderstood by them. Hence also Hee told vs aboue, *Lib. 1. contra Crescon. C. 32.* That if any doubt arise concerning the obscurity of Scripture we are to haue recourse to Christs holy Church, and receiue from Her satisfaction. To which purpose, S. Cyprian speaks most piously. *Lib. de Vnit: Ecclesiaz. Illius lacte nutrimur Spiritu eius animamur, adulterari non potest sponsa Christi.* We are nourished by the milk, we are animated by the Spirit of this faithful Spouse of Christ, which cannot play the Harlot, or become an Adulteress.

*S. Austins  
Iudgement  
concerning  
Scripture.*

Hh 3.

The:

8. The last Principle. The Rule of Faith is plain, or its own Self-evidence, apt of its own nature to convince the most obstinate Adversary, whether Jew, Gentil or Heretick, And for this reason must be immediatly credible by it Self, and for it self, otherwise it must suppose an other distinct Rule: yet more plain, more evident, more convincing and more immediatly credible, And that Rule à third, à fourth, And so in infinitum, which is impossible. Again, the Obiective Rule we Shall now speak of Answer's to the thing regulated by it, which is true, certain, and Divine Faith. This Rule then must not only be true, and certain in it self, but also certainly applyed to Believers, For a certain Rule in it self dubiously applyed to an vnderstanding, avails only to leaue all in Suspence and lead's none to any further Acquiescency, but to à wavering and vncertain Opinion, And this is neither suitable to firm Belief, nor to the Rule it self, which ought to establish vs in Gods reuealed truths, without doubt and hesitancy. Grant this Notion of à Rule to be exact (and none shall iustly except against it) All we haue said aboue of the Scriptures Insufficiency, to regulate Faith, or to decide controuersies, is no less than à Demonstration against Sectaries, Whereof more in the other Treatise? Disc. 2. *per totum*. Scripture Certainly is not plain in all things necessary to be believed, for were the true sense of it (which indeed is only Scripture) as plain and indisputably clear for the Arians, or Protestants in every particular controuersy, as their Doctrin is plainly delineated by them; Or contrariwise; were the sense of it as plain and indisputably clear for the Catholick Doctrin in Matters of debate, as the very Doctrin is taught by the Church, All Contention would soon cease, because either They, vpon the Supposition, must become Papists, or wee turn Arians and Protestants, Or finally be forced to deny plain Scripture. A most convincing Argument.

9. The difficulty therefore is not (and Sectaries seldom touch it) whether Scripture be true, were the sense known or not of Controuersy, but what that true sense is, which lies in obscurity, and cannot be known, without à certain Interpreter. Here is

What the  
Rule of  
Faith im-  
plies?

## Disc. 2. C. 1. to the present Controversy 247

the only Question debated between vs and Sectaries. One may Reply. It is no good-objection to say learned men differ about the sense of Scripture, Ergo it is not sufficiently plain, because à great wit may wrest the plainest words God euer spake to à sinister sense. Contra. 1. But who knowes, when two learned Parties contest in this Matter, which of them is the sinister Wrestler? Contra 2. When à whole Society of men as the Arians were, and Protestants are now, Tamper with à Text, which touches an essential point of Faith, And dissent from others as learned as Themselves about the meaning, The sense cannot be supposed more clear for the one than the other, without àn other Rule certain and Definitive. Pray you say. Is the sense of those words. *My Father is greater than I*, indisputably clear for the Arian? Or the sense of Christs words. *This is my Body* without controversy clear for the Protestants Doctrin concerning the Sacrament, when à whole learned Church opposeth both? Evidently No. Therefore our Nouellists must grant, that Scripture is not only obscure, in these two places, But more; That à Iudge is necessary to ascertain all of its true meaning, as well in these, as in à hundred other Passages. Again, if Scripture want this clarity, it cannot be its own Self-evidence, much less continue an obdurate Aduersary. Nay I say, though it were clear and the sense thereof agreed on by all called Christians, yet both Jewes and Gentils from the Diuinity of the book, And say if't be of Diuine inspiration, That must be proued by à certain Rule extrinsecal to Scripture, Therefore it is not immediarily credible *by it self, or for it self*. Lastly were Scripture plain in it self, yet (And this vtterly ruin's Sectaries) The certain Doctrin of it, can neuer be applyed indubitably to any vnderstanding, For our Nouellists say, because all Teachers of Christian Doctrin are fallible, none can make an infallible Application of it to any, or teach that Doctrin infallibly, which is in it self infallible. See more hereof in the other Treatise. Disc: 1. C. 2. and C. 4. N. 8.

*The only  
difficulty  
concerning  
Scripture.*

*Sectaries  
must acknowledge an  
Obscurity in  
Scripture.*

CHAP.

## CHAP. II.

*The Rule of Faith assigned : The Properties of a Rule  
 What is meant by the Church? Ancient Fathers  
 Assert that the Church is easily found out.  
 Her marks, more clear, than Her  
 Essential Doctrin*

1. **T**He true Church of Christ in this present State manifestly demonstrable by signal Marks and Motiues, is the only plain, certain, Self-evident Rule of Faith, apt to convince the most obdurate: Vnbelieuer. It is immediatly credible, and the Doctrin of it certainly applyed to a Seeker after truth. These Assertions stand firm vpon 3. Principles.

2. 1. Christ Iesus has prouided Christians of a clear and easy Rule, otherwise All are left in darknes, and know not what, or how to belieue.

3. 2. Nothing assigned by Sectaries, Bee it Scripture solely, or what els Imaginable, Carries so much as a weak probability of being a Rule so plain, easy, and satisfactory as the true Church is.

4. 3. All the properties of a Rule exactly agree to the Church of Christ and to Her only. 1. The Rule of Faith is plain, so is Church Doctrin and much more plain than Scripture; I mean, we easily vnderstand what the Church teaches though the Doctrin in it self be difficult. 2. A Rule is its own Self-evidence, so the Church is, taken with the Marks, and Motiues whereby She is demonstrated. 3. A Rule is apt to convince, the most obstinate Aduersaries; Christs Church has evidently don so, witness the innumerable Conversions wrought by Her vpon Iewes, Gentils,

*Christs  
 Church is  
 the Rule of  
 Faith,*

*Disc. 2. C. 2. The Properties of this Rule. 249*

Genils, and most obdurate Hereticks. 4. A Rule must be certain, and certainly applyed to Believers; what Christs true Church teaches is so, for She is Gods own Oracle, as shall be proued hereafter, and teaches her Children infallibly. The Truth of these particulars will be more fully laid forth in the sequele of this Discourse. In the mean while, two things are to be cleared. The first, what we vnderstand by the Church of Christ. 2. How and by what means She may be known? Thus much done, we shall easily find out those Christians, who are Members of this happy Society, or essentially constitute that visible moral Body, called the Holy Catholick Church.

*What is meant by the Church.*

5. Concerning the first. We speak plainly, and vnderstand by the Church à visible Society of true Believers, vnited in one profession of Christian Faith and the communication of Sacraments, vnder the Conduct and Gouvernment of Christs lawfull Commissioned Pastors. I say no more yet, hoping no Sectary can iustly quarrel with the Notion of à Church, expressed in such general Terms, And therefore waue at present that other worn-out controuersy agitated by Protestants. viz. Whether the Predestinate only make vp the true Church, or great Sinners also may be included, That is not at all to our purpose now, when we only seek after à Society of Christians vnited in the true Faith of Iesus Christ, who owne à due Submission to lawfull Commissioned Pastors, whether those who teach, or are taught, be Saints, or sinners, concerns them, tis true, but not our present Question. Of such Believers there cannot be two or more Churches, but one only; And to auoid all confusion, or the mingling of different Questions together, we here moue no doubt concerning the Head, or chief Authority of this Church, but immediately Ask, whether there is now, and has euer been, since Christs time, à visible diffused Society of Christians, who haue faithfully believed the Orthodox Doctrin of Christ, and vpon that Account well merit to be called the Professors of the true Catholick Church? Of this Vniuersal spread Society our Saviour spake most clearly, or of none. *His gates Can not preuaile against it. The Spirit of Truth abides with*

*The meaning of the question proposed.*



# 330 Disc. 1. C. 2. The Rule of Faith assigned.

to the end of the world &c. I think no Sectary will deny  
a Church.

6. The only difficulty now is to find out this Orthodox  
large diffused Body of Christians, united in one true Faith, and  
the sincere Worship of God. And nothing is more consonant to  
reason, more express in Holy Writ, or more clearly asserted by  
the ancient Fathers than that the true Church laies forth Her  
own evidence or clear Discernibility whereby She is distinguished  
from all Heretical Sects, That is, She lies manifestly open to all  
eyes, and Cannot but bee most easily known. She is a City  
built upon a mountain: The light of the world: A Tabernacle placed in  
the sun. *Ipsa est Ecclesia* saith S. Austin Epist: 186. *In se ipsa*  
*The Church is placed in the sun, Hoc est in manifestatione omnium*  
*pique ad terminas terra*, That is, She is known by Her own apparent  
and manifest Evidence all the whole world over. And because  
no one Father touches this point with greater Energy than S.  
Austin, Hear yet more. *Tract: 1. m. 1. Ioan: Paganus* Epist. 18.  
we can point at the Church and demonstrate it with a finger. *They*  
*are blind who see it not. Lib. 2. contra Crescon: Cap. 11.*  
*Extas Ecclesia.* The Church is in Being apparently clear and con-  
spicuous to all. Again, *Lib: 2. Contra Peril: C. 31. Nemo* is  
*per vera Ecclesia.* The Church of Christ lies hid to none. And  
*Lib: Contra crescon: C. 83.* The Church so clearly presents it self  
all sorts of men even to Infidels, that it stopp's the mouths of Pagans.  
See also this great Doctor, pondering those words of the  
Psalme. *Qui videbant me foras superunt &c. Obscurus.* Both He,  
*dixerunt Propheta de Christo, quam de Ecclesia &c.* The Prophets have  
spoken more darkly of Christ, than of the Church. And I think  
this was done, because they saw in spirit, that men would make ra-  
ties against the Church, and not contend so much concerning Christ  
ready to contend about the Church. Christ almost every where  
preached, by the Prophets in some hidden or covered Mystery, *Ecce*  
*aperit*, but the Church was pointed at so clearly that all might see  
it, and those also who were to bee against it. I value other  
Authorities, for tis tedious to prove a Manifest Truth, or late

S. Austin  
Judgement  
concerning  
The Church  
which Evi-  
dence.

transcribe plainer Testimonies relating to this subject. Thus much premised.

*An Assertion concerning Church Doctrine.*

*The Doctrine of Scripture, or The Church, not ground true by saying its true.*

7. I say first. Though Church Doctrine be more clearly expressed by the Church chiefly in all Matters of Controuersy, than in Scripture; For example: you know the Church delivers the *Consubstantiality* of the eternal Son, with greater clarity than Scripture expresseth that Truth, Yet no man can proue to reason this clearer Doctrine to be immediately true, vpon this sole ground, (Mark my precise words) *that the Church teaches it.* My meaning is. The Church yet not manifested to bee God's Oracle by marks extrinsecal to its Doctrine, leaues Reason so in suspence that it cannot say. *This is the Oracle which teaches Truth*, or, that the Doctrine of this not yet euident Society is Diuine, and Orthodox. The Assertion is so amply proued aboue that it is needles to press the Arguments further in this place. All I say now, is, that we discourtie in like manner of Scripture and Church Doctrine precisely considered as *Essentiall Doctrine*, not yet made Credible by *Signes and Markes*. As therefore the Verities of Scripture, are not known to be Diuine *Ex terminis*, because I read them in that Holy book. But must haue them proued Diuine vpon a certain Principle distinct from Scripture, So the Verities of the Church are not known *Ex terminis* to be certain, before I proue the Church by Clear Motiues to be the Oracle of Truth whereby God speaks to Christians. what I Assert is euident in Christ our Lord and his Apostles, when they first began to preach, For neither Iew, nor Gentil believed that Sacred Doctrine vpon their bare preaching. Nay, It scandalized the one, and seemed a foolery to the other, But when they saw it confirmed by Euident Signes and Wonders, by eminent Sanctity of life, by vdeniable Miracles, and other Signal marks which the Author of Religion laid open to Reason, Both Iewes and Gentils, were gained, moued to believe by Such Inducements no less prudent than forceably perswasive.

8. The reason of all *A Priori* giuen aboue, euinces thus much: None can indubitably and immediately own the Doctrine of either

272 Dife. 2. C. 2. *The Rule of Faith assigned.*

*The reason  
of our Affertion.*

Church, or Scripture as true and Orthodox but by one of these two means. Either the light of natural Reason discovers the Truth, Or it must be known by Faith: Reason alone, too weak to comprehend the Sublime Mysteries revealed in Holy writ taught by the Church; boggles at all, And, left to it self, rejects at least the harder Mysteries, as is manifest in both Jewes, and Gentils. Now to know them by obscure Faith is wholly impossible, vnless one haue sufficient Assurance before hand, grounded on other prudent extrinsecal Principles, That both Scripture, and the Church teach Diuine, and certain Doctrin. To know thus much, the Rational man must discourse And in this present state of things, first find out the Church, by her Marks, and Signes visible to all. If reason complies not with this duty, the Faith we draw from thence is no Faith, but, a precipitous foolish Credulity. For who can prudently assent to the high Mysteries of Christianity, vnlesse Reason first see it is prudent to do so? This is what the Apostle deliuer's in few but most pithy words. *Scio cui credidi, & certus sum.* That is, I first know why I am to belieue by Reason; and then stedfastly belieue without further reasoning. But enough of this in the Chapter cited aboue.

*The Church  
first proued  
Orthodox by  
rational  
Motiues.*

9. The. 2. Proposition. If the Doctrin of Christ's Church precisely considered according to its Essence, bee not *ex enormous* manifestly true, or proues not immediatly that the Church is Orthodox vpon Her own meer saying that She teaches Truth. It is euidēt, She must be proued Gods Oracle by Motiues, extrinsecal to Her Doctrin. Now these Motiues purely considered as Inducements to belieue, are not Articles of Faith, but *simple, reasonable*, and of such weight, that they powerfully incline every well disposed vnderstanding to this rational assent. As God immediately spake by Moses, by Christ, and his Apostles, So he now also speaks by his own true Church, And leads men vnder her safe Condukt to Salvation.

10. The ground of my Assertion, is no less euidēt, than the very Position it self. First, Christ himself neuer proued his Doc-

Disc. 2. C. 2. *The properties of this Rule.* 253

was true by merely saying it was so, but confirmed it by signes and wonders which made it immediatly credible as is sayd already, So also did his Apostles, And so doth the true Church to this day. 2. Unless Christians haue those prudent inducements previously applied to reason before they belieue the Holy Catholick Church, The wise prouidence of God must be supposed so neglectiue, as not to let men know after a prudent and diligent search, which or where his true Church is, Though Scripture Compares it to a glorious Sun, most visible to all And the Fathers say, they are blind that see it not. 3. All those Millions of Christians who belieued the true Church, who liued and dyed happily in it, (innumerable shed their blood for the verities of it) were not a People mad nor besotted vpon this Account, because They proceeded iust as the Primitive Christians did, that alwayes belieued vpon Rational Motiues. These Motiues then first enlightened the reason of the most ancient Christians, And reason afterward prevented by grace, submitted to all the Church teaches. Not much more of this hereafter, because of greatest Consequence, though it seem's Sectaries haue little regard to the Euidence of Christianity Drawn from rational Motiues.

*As the Primitive Christians more induc'd to believe, so are we.*

II. The. 3. Proposition. The Marks of Christs Church manifest to all, are more sensible and clear than the essentiall Doctrine, marked by them; They are peculiar to the true Church only, and distinguish Her from all Heretickal Communities; Finally taken all together, and not by Piece-meal, conuince this truth. *That God speaks to Christians by the Church.* Every part of the Proposition proues it self. First a Mark is more clear and sensible than the thing marked by it, For, who ever had seen our Blessed Sauour walking here on earth, and obserued his holy life, whoeuer had heard his sacred words, and seen his Miracles would haue said, his Sanctiury, words, and Miracles, were more clear and euident to all, than his Doctrin was of being God and man. Therefore the first Christians belieued that great Mystery induced by euident works, and wonders. 2. These Marks are peculiar and proper to the true Church only. You haue

### 354 Disc. 2. C. 2. The Rule of Faith assigned.

*The force of  
grudent  
Motiues.*

the reason hereof in the other Treatise. *Disc. 1. C. 2.* Because it is not possible, if a true Church be now on earth that God can permit a false Society to equalize it, much less to surpass it in the lustre of such Motiues as forcibly perswade to discern between *That*, and all heretical Communities. For were this done, Falshood would be made as credible to reason as truth, And God would be guilty of Arguing less efficaciously in behalf of his own Church, against Jewes, Gentils, and obstinate Hereticks.

*They distin-  
guish the  
true Church  
from false  
Communi-  
ties.*

12. Obserue well the Strength of this Argument. I say in a word. If an Arian could truly Assert: I haue as many forceable Motiues, And marks of truth belonging to my followers and Doctrin, As the now supposed true Church of Christ can shew for it self, could he say with truth I will euident the like Antiquity, the like Perpetuity, the like lawful Mission of my Pastor, the like vnyty in Faith, the like conuersions of Heathens wrought in and by my Church, The like succession of Bishops preaching my Doctrin from Christs time to this day, The like sanctity, the like miracles, as any Church on earth can demonstrate. Could an Arian, I say, (or Iew either) speak all this with truth, so Orthodox Christian could argue the one or other of Falshood in Doctrin: For grant thus much, These very men might much better handle and interpret Scripture than Protestants do, vny destitute of all such Marks. The Iew, if the false supposition should would draw the old Testament to his sense, and so would the Arian the new; And who could reprove them could they see you a Church bearing these signes of diuine Authority? Hence, Sectaries that only Gloss Scripture, and neuer had any thing like an euident Church which taught the Doctrin they now maintain, and so earnestly Gloss for, are most reprobable, and vainly attempt to draw any prudent man to a belief of their vnelities.

13. By all you see how important it is to haue a Christian Society clearly marked, and distinguished from false Communities, with euident Signes, and rational Motiues before we resort to Scripture.

Disc. 2. C. 2. *The properties of this Rule.* 235

Scripture. All faith depends on this greater Evidence laid forth to reason, as Shall be demonstrated towards the end of this Discourse.

14. I would have every one seriously to reflect on what is now said, and once more to know, That Christs Church like a glorious Sun evidenceth Her selfe by the Lustre of signal Marks, though her essential Doctrin believed by obscure Faith, appear's not Evident. Find me then out a Church euer in being since Christs time, vnited in one Faith, glorious in Miracles and conuerfions of Heathens, wherein Bishops and Pastors lawfully sent, haue preached Christs Doctrin age after age; Giue me a Church which was neuer censured or taxed of Errour by any Society of known Orthodox Christians, *She, and she only, is Christs true Spouse.* All other late risen Assemblies, are Conuenticles of Sams. And these Marks do not only distinguish Her from all such Conuenticles, as is now noted, but *Colleditiu* taken conuince this Truth, That God speak's to Christians by this Oracle, whether you haue more in the following Chapters.

*One only  
Church  
Sheweth best  
Marks.*

15. In the Interim we must enter vpon a further difficulty and next enquire, which among so many Congregations as now are and haue been in the world, is the only manifested true Spouse of Christ? For all, as I said aboue, make not one Church vnles Christ hath composed this mystical Body of such members as rightly believe, and of others that inuidiously oppose his sacred Doctrin. Now becauise the chief controuersy is between the Protestant and Catholick, The first pretend's to a Church which teaches Christs Doctrin; The Catholick utterly denies the Pretence and pleads for his *own* Oracle evidenced by prudent Motiues. This I say being the Contest, we are in the first place, to vindicate the Protestant, and then proue by undeniable Arguments, where and with whom the true Church of Christ is.

CHAP.



## CHAP. III.

*The Protestant has neither Church evidenced by Marks  
of Truth, nor true Doctrin made credible to reason.*

*His whole Faith is built vpon  
Fancy.*

1. **T**He Marks of the Church, as is now said, are so clear to reason, that they make the Oracle manifest to all sort of people, to the learned and vnlearned, to Iewes, to Infidels, and much more to Hereticks who pretend to belieue in Christ. All of them are alike concerned, and obliged to make a search after the true Church, and when it is found to belieue it.

*Questions  
Proposed  
to Seditaries.*

2. Now to find it out, I Ask, whether our English Protestants (with these we chiefly dispute) like well of the marks already hinted at, or will reiect them? I propose my doubt with all candor. Will they dare to say That their Church, as it deliues Protestants Doctrin, or, as it is now reformed in England, was euer since Christ time In Being, and visible to the world? Can they produce a Succession of Bishops, or Pastors, that taught Protestantcy Age after Age, without intermission? Can they show what Conuerfions these Protestant Pastors wrought vpon Heathens to their faith, fve or six Centuries since? Can they produce indubitable Miracles, done by such Pastors? Most evidently No. Therefore our later Protestants reiect these, and the other like Motiues, as slight and impertinent, to evidence their Church (which yet say they teaches Christs Doctrin) and wilily do so, because they haue none of them. Well. To leaue them without example, to silence them for euer; Here is an vn answerable Dilemma. Either the marks now kinted at are admitted or, reiected. Suppose them owned as clear cognifances of the true Church, or of Her Orthodox Doctrin, we most justly urge Protestants to prove,

what I know will neuer be made probable. Viz. To shew That they had a Church three or four Ages since inuested in the signes, and marks, now mentioned. On the other side, if which is usual, such marks be slighted as unmeet to manifest the true Church, it must be granted, They haue no euident Church, and Consequently no true Doctrin with it. Hence I Argue, Who euer belieues, in an uneuident Church, destitue of all Signes and marks of truth, belieues in no true Church; The Protestant belieues in such an uneuident Church, Therefore he belieues in no Church: But he who belieues in no Church belieues a Doctrin more than improbable, or absolutely false. And this is fancy or worse than fancy.

3. What answer think ye do Sectaries return to this Argument? A strange one indeed. They tell vs the only Mark of the Church lies not in any external Notes, but appear's in the written word of God, and the Purity of Scripture. So Alstedius. *Lib. de notis Ecclesie* C. 29. Whitaker *Contro.* 2. 9. 5. C. 17. and Mr Stillingfleet here and there, seem's well pleased with the fancy. Contra. 1. The Church had her Marks before Scripture was written, what euer sensible Signes then distinguished that Holy Society from all heretical Conuenticles, makes it yet known to the world and Still as clearly point's it out, For, the writing of Scripture nothing at all obscured, the exterior lustre of those Signes, or prudent Motiues. Contra. 2. A Mark which makes an obscure thing known is euer more clear and sensible, than that which is marked by it. The Church, Say Sectaries, is obscure and must be first known by Diuine Scripture, But this very Diuinity of Scripture, is more obscure than the Church (For it is not its own Self-evidence, nor known *ex terminis* to be Diuine) Therefore vnless this Diuinity be made manifest by an other light, it cannot giue to all the first notice of the Church, which appears More clearly to sense and reason, by its own Signes, than Scripture doth.

*They return  
no probable  
Answer.*

*The Church  
more clearly  
manifested  
than Scrip-  
ture.*

4. Hence it follows. 1. That, Scripture, which should first mark out the Church, cannot do it; being more obscure than

than the thing marked by it. It follows. 2. That the Church thus marked, is its own Self-evidence, not Farther demonstrable to Reason. Who euer therefore deprives the Church of her external Motiues, or takes from her the glory of Miracles, or Antiquity, Conuerfions, &c. Shall long grope in the dark before Hee find's either Church, or Scripture, You will say Scripture known by the vniuersal Tradition of Christians, may well mark out and first discover the true Church, Tradition being à thing most known, and Sensible to all. Contra. This very Tradition either supposes à Church signalized with other rational Motiues, or excludes them; And imports no more but the bare Consent of Christians, that accept of Scripture as Gods Diuine word. Grant the first; we haue all that's wished. Plead only by the Second, or tell à *Heathen* (who may be gained to believe the Church) That all Christians vniuersally own Scripture as Diuine, and mention nothing of Miracles or other Motiues manifest in the Church, He will soon reply. The Chinese haue also vniuersal Tradition or à general consent of à People largely diffused for their Bible; The Turks haue it for their Alcoran, yet such à Tradition alone is no Mark of Gods word or the true Church. Why then should it be à mark to Christians, if no more be said?

3. And the Heathen easily makes his Plea good by this convincing Reason à *Priori*. Before this vniuersal Tradition was, before you so many Christians agreed in the Belief of your Bible, the Doctrin Thereof was made credible vpon other Motiues. These Motiues are not now extinguished, or of lesser account because you haue agreed on the Scriptures Diuinity. Nay they must be presupposed to haue been before you agreed. For the Agreement is not the cause of the Bibles credibility, but an effect of the same. That is, Therefore so many Christians haue agreed by à vniuersal Consent, that Scripture is Gods Word, because it was made credible to Reason Antecedently, to an Agreement so vniuersal. But the ground of this Agreement was no other but the Authority of the Orthodox Church gloriously euenced, by the Lustre of

Of what  
weight  
pleading  
Tradition is

The Heathens  
exceptions  
against Tra-  
dition only.

Disc. 1. C. 3. Protestants proued Churches, 259

her Signes and Motiues &c. This Principle alone, vtterly ruins Mr. Stillingfleets Resolution of Faith, as shall be made clear in another place.

6. Again saith the Heathen, you Protestants discours not probably, you iust proceed as one doth who laies Colours before a blind man and bid's him iudge of them. You say, that both I and Iewes are blind, and cannot discouer the light which lies in the Scriptures Diuinity. If this be so, how can you imagine that I may find out the true Church by the light of Scripture (though admitted vpon Tradition) which I can no more look on than an owle on the Sun, at Noon-day? Neither will it help you at all, if you Say. Scripture interpreted both Mark's, and manifest's the true Church, For I must first know that Scripture is Diuine, before I giue credit to any Interpreter, And though I were ascertained of that Diuinity, yet I am still to seek whether your Interpretation, or the Arians be better, and this I cannot know without a sure Rule extrinsick to Scripture, And all fallible Interpretation. Yet the Heathen hath not done; but pinches the Protestant shrewdly. Admit, saith he, that Scripture Mark's out the Church, and giues vs the first Euidence of it, when it tells vs. *The Church is a City built vpon a Mountain, and founded on a Rock. That all Nations shall flock to it. That Christ will be with it to the end of the World; That it euer had, and will haue Pastors, Visible, and audible, till we all meet in one Vnity of Faith. That it is the Pillar, and ground of Truth &c.* Can you, my good Protestants, show me such a Church belonging to you three or four Ages since when, you had not one single man in the world professing your Protestant Religion? Where was then your Protestant City visible on a Mountain? What Rock stood it on in those times, when it was not in being? What Nations, what Iewes what Gentils did it then conuert to your Novelities? How was Christ then with it, and taught it all Truth, when there was no such Church to learn his Doctrin? Giue me a Catalogue, of your Visible Pastors at that time, or tell me how your Church was then a pillar, an Oracle of truth, whilst all it teaches now is fallible, and may be false?

He clearly  
conuincers  
Sethians.

K k 2

7. Hence

*An Argument drawn from what is now said.*

7. Hence I argue. What Scripture saith is true; Scripture here speaks of à Church founded by Christ, of an *Antient* *Visible Society*, of Her perpetual Pastors without interruption, of à Church conuerting Nations &c. Therefore it speak's Truth, and points at à sure Oracle marked with the notes we plead for, who euer then admit's Scripture, must ioyn'tly own these Marks and Signatures of the true Church, But yee Sectaries admit Scripture and haue no such Marked Church, with Antiquity, continuance of Pastors &c. Ergo you are not members of the true Church, which must necessarily be found in some other Society of Christians.

8. Here by the way, we must preuent à triuial Obiection, For some less knowing Aduersary may reply. Wee destroy our own Ground, and now proue the Marks of the Church by Scripture, whereas we suppose the Scripture first proued to be of Diuine Inspiration, because the Church manifested by her Marks and Motiues saith so.

9. I Answer we proue the Marks of the Church, and the Form of her essential Doctrin also by Scripture, But how? Vpon à Supposition, that the Book be first proued Diuine by Church Authority, Thus much done, it is an excellent Principle, But not *Primum indemonstrabile, its own Self-Evidence*, Or first indemonstrable Principle. This Truth is clear, For no man goes about to conuert à Iew by alleging Passages out of the new Testament, or to draw à Heathen to Christianity by any thing written either in the old, or new Scripture. As therefore that man would not be well in his wits, who hopes to conuert à Protestant, by merely alleging the Definitions of the Council of Trent which he slights, so he would be as senseless, did he hope to conuert à Heathen by Scripture only, as much vndermined by him, as the present Definitions of the Church are by Protestants. Hence you see how Scripture is à Principle against Sectaries, who admit it, and reiect an infallible Church. By Scripture we Argue and conuince them of error, might the words Thereof bear their proper sense without fancied Glosses, Yet

*Scripture not the first in demonstrable Principle.*

## Disc. 2. C. 3. Protestants proued Churchles. 261

we make à right *Analysis*; it is not the first indemonstrable Principle but, *Pet. Modum suppositionis* only, that is, it must be either supposed or proued Diuine.

10. I say yet more. Though both the Jew, and Heathen, owned Scripture as it truly is, à Book indited by the Holy Ghost, yet they haue but made one step, as it were, towards Christianity. For when such men look well about them, and find Scripture differently sensed by so many iarring Heads as haue it in their hands, by *Arians, Socinians, Quakers, Protestants, &c.* (Catholicks dissent from them all) where can, I beseech you, these half Christians, whether *Jewes, or Heathens* securely rest? With whom can they rationally vnite Themselues? whose sense must they believe and own as the vndoubted meaning of the Holy Ghost? To doe any thing prudently in so weighty à Matter is impossible, Unless they first come to the knowledge of Christs true Church, which as well Ascertain's them of the Scriptures sense in all Controuerted points of Faith, as it doth, of the Book's Diuinity. Now further. It is not possible to know the true sense of Scripture but by the Church; it is not possible to know the Church, but by her Marks, (the essential Doctrin Thereof no more mark's it self as true, than Scripture Doctrin denotes its own Diuinity) The Sectary therefore that rob's the Church of her Marks and the external *Glory of Miracles, Conuerfions, Persecuty &c.* is guilty of three hainous crimes at once.

11. First he makes the Conuerfion of à Jew to Christianity most impossible. I'll show you how. The Jew Admit's. of the old Testament and drawes from euery passage which speak's of Christ and the Church, à Sense quite different from that which Christians own. The Protestant admit's both the Old and New Scripture, And as we may Suppose, is at à hot dispute with à Jew concerning Christian Religion. First saith the Jew, Lay, Sir, your New Testament aside, which is no Principle with me. Because it neither euidences it Self immediatly to be Gods word, nor can you proue it Diuine vpon any sure ground extrinsecal to the Book. Therefore we must Argue by à Principle common

*Though it were so there yet remains à difficulty not so bee solved.*

*Sectaries make the Conuerfion of Jewes impossible.*



*The Affertion, proued.*

to vs both, *The old Testament only.* You read There, I read also, You know the Original language, so do I, You compare Text with Text, I doe the like, You Gloſs, and I Gloſs againſt you, Yet after all is done, you draw one ſenſe out of this very Scripture, and would proue Chriſt to be the true Meſſias, I draw from thence an other quite Contrary, And ſay He is not. My demand is, whether Chriſt, whom you Adore, hath prouided men of better means (Than your Gloſſes and mine are) whereby we may certainly know what the ſenſe of this Scripture is? If he haue done ſo, it can be nothing but a Church manifested by Supernatural Signes and miracles, (for God now teaches none by Angels or Enthuſiaſms) if the guidance of a Church be wanting we are all left in darkneſs, And know not what Senſe to make of Scripture; and this ill beſeems the Goodnes of a Sauour, who, as you ſay, came to enlighten the world and teach all truth, which is not done, For he leaues Reaſon in Darkneſs and Teaches not where his true Church is. It may well be the Proteſtant will except againſt his Aduerſaries Gloſſes, but He is ſoon ſilenced, for Saith the Jew, you good man, when you treat with Papiſts interpret Scripture as you pleaſe, and why may not I proceed ſo with you, And uſe the like liberty?

*What Sectaries are guilty of.*

12. The ſecond crime committed by the Proteſtant, who depriues the Church of Her external Signes, is, that he Eclipse that great light of the world (which as Origen ſaith ſhines to all) And make it as Obliture, as ſome Proteſtants make their Church inuiſible before Luther. What I ſay is certain, For no man can find the Church by reaſon, when all rational Motiues are taken from it, And held impertinent to illuſtrate that great moral Body. Hence you ſee the third ſin of Sectaries relating to Scripture. This Book alſo loſeth all credit with Chriſtians, becauſe it Euidenceth not its own Diuinity, nor can any Signalized Church tell vs, it is Diuine, or certainly declare the true ſenſe thereof, to either learned or vnlearned.

13. My laſt argument againſt the Proteſtant is no Topic, nor bare Probability, but a plain Demonſtration. The Title ſaith, This

Disc 2. C. 3. *Protestants proued Churchles* 263

This reformed man has no Christian Doctrin made credible to Reason, whilst he belieues as *Protestant*. To proue the Assertion, Three Principles are here Supposed. First, that the Markes of the Protestant Church or of its Doctrin lie (as these men will haue it) in the Purity of Scripture only. 2. That their Church Doctrin is either contained in the 39. *Articles*, or implies so much as all called Christians Belieue, and no more; Though plain Hereticks in many particular Tenets. 3. That this Protestant Community as it Teaches, is either the whole Church of Christ excluding other Societies, or only à Part of the vniuersal Church. These Principles Supposed, you haue my Demonstration.

*The last  
conuincing  
Argument.*

14. Scripture Marks the true Doctrin of Christs Church, but it neither mentioneth nor marks out the Doctrin contained in the 39 *Articles*, for our newes men call these inferiour Truths *new*, And hold them not Registred in God's word. Neither doth it Assert so much as darkly; that à Mixture of Truth, and Fals-hood, (such as all Hereticks haue owned and doe own) is the Doctrin of the true Catholick Church; Least of all, That à Doctrin common to Arians, Protestants, and Catholicks, is sufficient to Salvation. Lastly, it saith no where, that the Protestant Church containing that reformed Doctrin, is by it Self the whole true Church of Christ excluding all other Societies, not so much as à Part of it, And this I proue:

*Scripture  
disowns.  
Protestancy.*

15 If as reformed, it be à Part of the true Catholick Church, the Professors of it haue now, and had before Luther some Partners who ioynd with them in the belief of their reformed Doctrin, But before Luther, they had not one sole man in the world that belieued as they belieue, and so wanted fellowship, because neither they, nor their Partners were at all in Being: Now at this instant, they haue no Society of men, called à Church; (namouerall the world) which side's with them, or hold's either the 39. *Articles*, or à Doctrin common to all Christians, to be the true Doctrin of Christ, or of his vniuersal Church. All this I say is euident. And.

16 Hence you see, in what plight these men are, who pretend

264 Disc. 2. C. 3. *Protestants proued Churchles.*

*A clear  
inference  
against  
Sectaries.*

tend to à Church marked and made euident by Scripture, and when they haue that sacred Book in their hands, it is impossible to find so much as one Sentence or syllable in behalfe of Protestantcy. Those other exteriour Signes of Conversions, Miracles, Antiquity &c. are of no Account with them, And were they otherwise, most euidently they belong not to the reformed Doctrin of the English Church. Here is à piece of sad news for Sectaries, who haue à Church neither Spoken of in Scripture, nor manifested to Reason by one Supernatural wonder. So vneuidenced à Thing it is, And Consequently vpon à double Account, no Church at all.

*A Reply  
Answered.*

17. The Sectary may reply. When he Asserts Scripture Marks the true Church or Her Doctrin, the meaning is not that it speak's expressly the Tenets of Protestants, but only Saies, it is à sufficient *Repository* of all things necessary to Salvation, and deliuers so much plainly. What euer therefore is not plainly taught in scripture ceaseth to be necessary. Contra. 1. Protestants granting thus much, may seek long before they find Their particular Tenets, because Scripture deliuers none of them either expressly, or by any clear Deduction. Contra. 2. The Iew and Heathen regard not the plainest Truths in Holy Writ before the book be proued Diuine, The most plain Verities auile nothing with them, Yet God hath afforded means to draw them to Christianity. But it seem's our Sectaries in all their talk of the Scriptures clarity, neuer reflect on these Strangers from Christ, nor point at the means whereby their Conuerſion may bee wrought. Contra. 3. The Arian and the Orthodox as highly differ about the sense of plain Scripture, as the Protestant and Catholick, about the sense of Christs own words. *Thus is my body*, And these differences, either touch on fundamental Matters, or there are none such in the whole Bible. Contra. 4. The Protestant only tells vs what he faith of all things necessary contained in Scripture, and speak's his own Sentiment boldly, without either proof or Principle.

18. Some

## Disc. 2. C. 3. Protestants proued Churches. 265

18. Some object first. God can endite à Book in as plain words as any man can speak, and 't is not supposed, that he affected obscurity in his own Scripture, already written. Contra. 1. If Scripture be not obscure. How is it That Christ told the Seduces they mistook the true meaning of it? How is it, that these Protestant Pillars Luther and Calvin, so grossly contradict one an other in their Commentaries made vpon holy Scripture, And this in points most material? How is it that innumerable others called Christians Professe. to reuerence, to Read, to spend the greatest labour vpon Scripture, and when all is done draw out of it plain Contradictions in points, as is now said, most Fundamental? Contra. 2. We question not what God can do, but say he hath not endited Scripture plain, *de facto*. S. Peter. Epist. 2. 3. 16. Speaking of S. Pauls Epistles, is my warrant. In which, saith he, *Certain things are hard to be vnderstood, which the vnlearned, and vnstable depraue, as also the rest of Scripture, to their own perdition.* And the words relate not only to the Mysterious Matters whereof the Apostle wrote, but to his Phrase and forme of writing also, Therefore the Greeck Copies haue both *in which things*, and in which Epistles, And all Expositors hitherto, euen S. Austin, haue acknowledged an obscure way of speaking in S. Pauls Epistles, chiefly in that to the Romans. Yet we are not to say that God affects Obscurity (the word is vnmeet) but speak thus: His prouidence purposely would haue Scripture deliuered in such à dark manner, that all might haue recourse to à liuing Oracle, (His true Church) which speaks more plainly, and cannot swerue from any verity in Scripture, No offence is giuen to pious ears, In à word you haue à Verity expressed with out harshness. See S. Austin lib. 2. *de Doctr. Christ.* c. 6. And S. Ambrose Epist. 44. Again vote Scripture most plain, what gain Sectaries by the Clarisy, when they neither haue plain, nor obscure Text through the whole Bible for their Protestancy?

*An Objection solved,*

*Truth expressed without harshness.*

19. Hence we Answer to an other petty objection. Scrip-

L1

ture

266 Disc. 2. C. 4. *The Roman Catholick Church.*

ture ( say some ) relates many Things not necessary to Salvation, Therefore it cannot be supposed to omit things necessary. Contra: 1. *Ergo* it speaks some things of pure Protestantcy, or nothing in that Religion, as reformed, is necessary to Salvation. I would willingly haue an exprest Text for this reformed Nouelty, and these few difficulties solved. Contra. 2. Though the whole Bible were without dispute most plain, or told vs all things necessary, yet this neither moves Iew nor Gentil, nor draws any to Christianity without further light, as is already proued. We haue shown about how Scripture contain's all things necessary in the Reflex Part thereof. It is now our Task and intent to Mark out the true Church of Christ ( the only Rule of Faith ) which decides all Controuerfies Concerning Religion.

CHAP. IV.

*The one and only true Church of Christ, was, is, and shall  
euer be the Holy, Apostolical, and Catholick Ro-  
man Church. Her Antiquity and Constant  
Perseuerance in the Ancient primitive  
Doctrin, without Alteration,  
proues The Assertion.*

1. **I**T is hard to illustrate a manifest Truth, because what ever reasons are brought to light for it, surpass not much the Euidence of the thing you would make clear. Who euer goes about to proue by Arguments that the Sun is the most luminous Body in the Heauens will haue much to do, because that's euident to our senses, and so is the true Church of Christ; *saith*  
S. Austin,

S. Austin, *digito demonstrari potest*, She can be pointed at with your finger. Origen adds *Hom. 33. in Matth.* She is like à sun, casting her beams from one part of the world, to the other. However, because we now treat with men, who either see not, or pretend not to see, I will giue them all the Euidence gathered from demonstratiue Signes which à heart can wish for.

1. I say first, before we come to more conuincing Arguments. Antiquity is à certain Note of Christ Church., The reason is. As God was before the Diuel, and Truth before falshood, So the Orthodox Church, whether you take it from Adam, or from the first preaching of Christian Doctrin, was before all Sects and Heresies. The Roman Catholick Church only which Christ founded, and is so much extolled by the Apostle, has this Precedency. It was, when the Arians were not, we know their first Rise, it was when the Pelagians were not, we know their Beginning, it was when the Donatists were not, their Origen is as well known, as that of Protestants, which first peeped out with one unfortunate Luther, something about an age since. Might not then the Roman Catholick Church, more ancient than all these Sectaries, haue most iustly questioned, each of them at their first appearance, as the learned Tertullian. *Lib: de Prescrip.* did those of His time? *Qui estis vos?* who are you new men? *Vnde & quando venistis?* From whence came you? *Vbi tam diu latuistis?* Where haue ye been hid so long? No body yet saw you, or heard of you. I waue the Testimonies of other Fathers, (chiefly of S. Austin and S. Hierome) though none presses this Argument drawn from Antiquity with greater efficacy, than Optatus Meliuitan. *Lib: 2. contra Parmenian.* They are known to euery one. But this Mark must not goe alone.

*Antiquity denotes the true Church*

3. I say. 2. Antiquity, and à neuer interrupted Continuance of the same Visible Society Age after Age, and the same Doctrin vpheld without change or Alteration, clearly euident the Christs Church. This Scripture strongly Asserts. *Ofse. 2.* when the Church is said to be espoused to Christ in *Sempiternum*.

*The Church once true neuer changed her Doctrin.*



268 Dist. 2. C. 4. *The Roman Catholick Church*

for ever. *Matth: 16.* Hell gates shall never prevail against it. *Matth: 28.* Christ will be with it to the end of the world. upon which Passage, *S. Hierome* speaks most clearly: *Qui vñq. ad consummationem seculi &c.* He who promised to be with his own Disciples to the end of the world, both shewes that these blessed men shall ever live (in their successors) and that he will not depart from the true Believers. *Psalm: sicut luna &c.* They are words of *S. Ambrose lib: 4. Hexam.* The Church may be seen like the moon eclipsed, but never perished. She may be clouded and over cast with darknes, but cannot fail. The reason is. If Christs Church could fail, not only all memory of his sacred Passion with the other Mysteries of our Faith, but the whole Scripture also would for that time of her supposed Deficiency have been no objects of Belief. None could then have said with truth; *I believe the Holy Catholick Church*, or have had Access to it, because it was not then in Being. Now further. As the Church cannot fail, so She cannot Alter from her self or change Christs Doctrin. For if She did so, She were no more Orthodox, Christ could not own Her for his Spouse. Ponder *S. Austins* Discourse on this subject in *Psalm: 101. Exultate qui dicunt &c.* There are some who say. This is not the Church of all nations which once was. No. That's gone, and thus they speak, just the Saint, because they are not of the true Church. *O impudent rosem, illa non est, quia tu in illa non es.* O impudent speech, it is not the same Church it was, because thou art not in it. *Pride in ideo non su.* look to thy self, least thou be not, for the Church will be, although thou were not in the world. Then heretics this Doctrin of the Churches failure as most abominable, detestable, and pernicious; And in *Psalm: 60.* positively Asserts the permanency of it to the end of the world.

4. Hence I argue. But the Roman Catholick Church only, hath ever continued in being without interruption and never changed, or Altered the Doctrin which She first learned of Christ. Protestancy which began one only Age since, most evidently wants this continuance, and every year put's on a new countenance. Therefore the Roman Catholick Church, and not that

Authority  
and.

Reason proves  
the Assertion

S. Austins  
Judgement.

The proba-  
tion urged.

of Protestants, is the Spouse of Christ. That the Roman Catholick Church stood permanently in being euer since Christ, is as demonstrable, as that Protestants were not before Luther. The Visible perpetual Succession of our Popes, of our Bishops, of our Pastors and of our Catholick People in all ages, is an irrefragable Proof. Neither do Sectaries much cauil at this Personal Succession, or the exteriorour Permanency of our Church (for that's euident) But here is their Plea. This Church (say they) once Orthodox changed from her selfe, forged new Articles of faith, Contrary to the primitiue Doctrin, Herein lies the great Charge. Now if I demonstrate, that the Roman Catholick Church once confessedly Orthodox, hath euer since been Visible in the world, and neuer swerued from the pure Primitiue Doctrin in after Ages, She is certainly the Church of Christ still without Alteration. You will Ask how can this be euinced?

What Sectaries object.

Some may think 'tis best done by Paralleling our present known Church Doctrin with that of the Primitiue Times. Very good. But by what means shall we come to a right Parallel? One may Say. Make A diligent Inspection into the Records, and Writings of those worthy Fathers, who liued in the first Ages, And all is done. I Answer. This Rule precisely considered, help's nothing. For what if those Fathers neuer medled with most of the Controuerfies, now agitated between vs and Sectaries? And t'is no wonder at all if they did not, For may not a new Sort of Hereticks rise vp to morrow, whose Errors neuer entred into the thoughts either of the Fathers, or of any man now liuing? Again, What if most of those ancient Writings be lost, (many certainly are) we are at a Stand. But finally, what if doubts arise concerning the sense of those few preserved copies yet extant? can Sectaries Glosses or ours either determin what's right Orthodox Doctrin by them? No. Therefore as I said aboue, no man can come to a full, exact, and satisfactory knowledge, of the Primitiue Truths, but by the voice and Tradition of the present Church. Reiect this voice of the present Church, we are cast into darkness, we may dispute long but

By what means one may come to the primitiue Doctrines

## 270 Disc. 2. C. 4. the Roman Catholick Church

end nothing. Now because it lies not in my way to Treat of that excellent Rule of Tradition, learnedly-handled by others, I begue you three Conuincing reasons, And proue my Assertion. viz. That the Roman vniuersal Church, once Orthodox, neuer changed the Primitive Doctrin. To show this, Two certain Principles are to be reflected on.

*An Argument  
proving the  
Roman  
Catholick  
Church still  
pure in  
Doctrin.*

6. First. God had alwaies an Orthodox Church on earth founded by Christ, which was, and is pure without mixture (at least) of notorious damnable Errours, and which neuer taught Christians any shameful, false Doctrin; for had it done so in any Age, it had then ceased *eo ipso* to be Christ's pure Church. The 2. Principle. Protestants confess, (and 'tis à certain truth) that the Roman Catholick Church continued Orthodox without Notable error, for the first three or four Centuries.

7. Hence I argue. If this Church once pure, abandoned Christ's Doctrin in after Ages, or forged new Articles of faith contrary to the Primitive verities, that Change was Notorious, shameful, and damnable, as we shall see presently. But it is not possible, that She euer made such à shameful, Notorious change, And here is my Reason: Had She done so, Christ in that Age when this supposed Alteration began, would haue had no Orthodox Church on earth free from gross and culpable Error, and Consequently his own pure Church would wholly haue been abolished.

*One reason  
urged,*

8. You will Ask how I proue this? I Answer most evidently. Begin if you please from the third Age, when the Roman Church was pure, And descend to Luthers dayes, you will find all the known Societies of men called Christians, to haue been either Orthodox Belieuers, Or grossly erring in Faith, yea plain condemned Hereticks, And so reckoned of by Protestants. Such were the *Arians, Nestorians, Pelagians, Monotelites, Donatists* &c. And all others nameable, excepting Roman Catholicks. But those gross erring men, evidently taught not Christ's pure Doctrin without notable Error, much less constituted either à Part, or the whole Orthodox Church, which Christ establi-  
shed

shed in truth, Therefore if the Roman Catholick Church went to wrack also, if She erred *notoriously* with these known erring Societies, the Orthodoxism and Purity of the *Whole Church* ceased to be in the world. And this is impossible.

9. Here in à word is all I would say. Christ had euer à Church Entirely pure on earth, for he founded one pure, which should alwaies continue in that integrity laid in Her very foundation; But no error was laid in the foundations of the Roman Catholick Church once Confessedly pure, therefore no notorious Error stained it in after Ages; Or, if any such error fouled that once fair Spouse of Christ, this Sequele is euident: *There was at that time no pure Church in Being*, vnless our Nouelists please (and perhaps they may do so in time) to make *Arians*, *Donatists*, and such à rabble of men, more Orthodox Christians than their own Progenitors were, and all the Roman Catholicks are now, the whole world ouer.

10. You see I insist vpon *notorious Errors*, And do so on set purpose to preuent à Reply of some newer Sectaries, who say the Church of Rome hath indeed Her Errors, But not fundamental, or destructive of Saluation. And will you know the reason of this trifling? Here it is. If they say She was not Orthodox in fundamentals, there was no true Church in being for à thousand years before Luther, and this no Christian dare Assert, And if they make her Orthodox in euery Article She taught, both Hereby and Schilsm fall's shamefully vpon Protestants, Who dare not grant they abandoned à Church Entirely pure and blameless, when they left it. Hence à middle way was wisely (or rather most simply) thought of: Our Church, forsooth, must be what Protestants please, partly true. viz. in à few Fundamentals, and partly false in other Matters of less concern, which these men, elected by God, were to reform, and tell exactly what was amiss, or how far it hath erred, &c. And therefore name themselues the *Reformed Church*. Well. Let this whimsy pass, largely refused in the other Treatise, and in passing take notice of a pitifull Church indeed which Christ had by these mens own Confession

*Why wee  
insist vpon  
Notorious  
errors,*

ten

272. *Dife. 1. C. 4. the Roman Catholick Church.*

ten whole ages before Luther. It was à meer deformed Monster made vp of Linzy wolzy stuff, of tawny Colours, of something, and nothing, in à word of Truth and Falsbood. But here is not all.

*Faith totally  
ruined in  
Sectaries,  
Principles.*

11. I am to proue much more, if Protestants Principles stand firm. viz. That neither we nor they, had any Orthodox Church in fundamentals before Luther, and Consequently no true Church was in being for ten whole Ages. Now most evidently, Sectaries had nothing like à Church, for they were not in the world. And it is as euident, if their Charge hold good against our Church, it had bin much better neuer to haue appeared than to see it turned into so many vgly shapes, into such an vnfashioned Monster as these new men make it. In à word this ancient Catholick Society, if Sectaries say right (and Mark euer the Supposition) erred notoriously in the very fundamentals of Faith, and neither beliened in Christ, nor Creed, and therefore there was no Orthodox Church before Luther, nor yet is, to this day. If Leuidence not this vpon the supposition now made, neuer Credit me hereafter. To doe it, please to obserue that by à fundamental Errour in Faith, I vnderstand à Doctrin, which if falsly taught, contrary to Christs verities, is as damnable to those who teach it, as the Arians errors are at this day damnable to Arians. Hence I Argue.

*The Assertion  
manifestly  
proued.*

12. What euer Society of men forges new Articles of Faith contrary to the Primitiue Doctrin, or tell's the world à lye, that God reuealed such things as he neuer reuealed, but vnterly disowns and yet execrat's, And more ouer obliges all Christians, after à sufficient proposál, to belieue such falsities vpon Diuine Reuelation, and this vnder pain of damnation, doth open iniury to Gods Infinite verity, Assert's that which Eternal Truth neuer taught And therefore sins damnably, or err's in the fundamentals of Faith. But Protestants, say, the Roman Catholick Church long before Luther did so, ergo She sinned damnably and erred in the very fundamentals of Faith. That She did is euident vpon their own charge, For this Church taught

*ynblow*

## Disc. 2. C. 4. is *The only true Church* 173

namely sacrifice neither Christ nor the Primitive Church taught so: It defines Transubstantiation to be an Article of Faith, Christ and the Primitive Church never did so. It maintain's Purgatory, Praying to Saints &c. Christ neuer deliuered such Doctrins, nor the Primitive Church believed so. Now further. These are all loud Lies if Sectaries speak Truth, and our Church obliges all Christians to believe them as truths reuealed by an infinite Verity vnder pain of damnation, which yet, as they suppose were not reuealed. Therefore She first openly iniures Gods Veracity, which can be no light Offence, but mortal and damnable, And consequently err's in the very fundamentals of Faith, Therefore vpon that account is now no Orthodox Church, nor was so before Luther. And here briefly is the vltimate reason of all that's said. The enormous Sin of all Hereticks past and present consists in this only, that they pertinaciously charge, or fasten vpon God a Doctrin Hee neuer taught, this alone makes them Hereticks, but the Church of Rome, say Sectaries, hath don so, ergo She was, and is yet Heretical.

*Wherein the Sin of all Hereticks Consists.*

13. If this Argument which I hold demonstratiue conuince not, I will propose an other and then briefly solve one or too Objections. The Arians who deny à Trinity of Diuine Persons, are guilty of à fundamental Errour. All grant it. Ergo the Roman Catholick Church was, and is as guilty, or rather more guilty if Protestants doe not Calumniate. I proue it. The Arians errour related to à sublime and speculatiue Mystery which transcends all humane Capacity, But one supposed Errour of the Roman Church (as Sectaries tell the Story) is worse and more gross, to wit, à plain, palpable and practical Idolatry. Why? She Adores à piece of bread for God, wherefore if Idolatry was euer in the world, She committ's that grieuous Sin And errs damnably, But no Sin can be greater, no Errour is more destructive of Christian faith, than Idolatry; If then our Church be guilty of that crime, She is far enough from being fundamentally Orthodox. Here is the Argument.

*An other Argument Vrged.*

14 One may Answer, it is only the Sectaries Opinion ( which

M m

is



274 Disc. 2. C. 4. *The Roman Catholick Church.*

is fallible and may be false) that we are Idolaters. What then? You Nouellists hold the opinion, you print it, you publish it, and perswade Thousands, and Thousands poor beguiled souls, we are Idolaters, and they Iudge so of vs, And as long as that Iudgement stand's immouable, they cannot own vs Orthodox Christians in Fundamentals. But let vs come more closely to the point, and speak of rhe thing in it self.

15. Here is à Dilemma. We are Idolaters, or not; Grant the first; We err in the fundamentals of Faith, and were no Orthodox Church either before or after Luther. Contrarywise, if we be not Idolaters but only Adore the Sauour of the world, really and substantially present, vnder the Forms of bread and wine, Ye Gentleman, do not only hideously calumniate à whole Ancient Church, And sin damnably; But more ouer Err in à fundamental point of Faith, For, if the Second part of the Dilemma subsist's. viz. That we Adore not à piece of bread, but that very Christ substantially present ( vnder the Species of bread) who dyed on à Cross, The whole errour, the whole Sin, you charge on vs, fall's heauily on your Selues. You first tell the world à plain lie and say God neuer reuealed Christ's real Presence, in à consecrated Host as the Catholick Church belieues, whereas vpon the Supposition now made, He has reuealed it; Therefore you contradict God, you iniure an infinite Verity, which is à hideous fundamental errour. Of such consequence it is to Tax à whole Ancient Church of false Doctrin, That to say so, is à flat Heresy, and the Calumny without repentance is damnable.

*Error and  
sin, fall hea-  
uily on  
Seditaries.*

16. 2. You oblige all you teach, and this vnder pain of Damnation, not to fall down or Adore Christ, substantially present in the Sacrament, yet vpon the supposition ( which is euer to be minded) he is really there and claims the highest honour the supreme worship, as most due to his sacred Person. This you scornfully deny, and both err and sin damnably. One may Answer you adore Christ in Heauen, and that's enough. Contra. He merits Adoration whereuer he is present, for if he should visibly appear to any of you all, you would (if Christians) fall down  
and

Disc. 2. C. 4. is the only true Church. 275

and Adore him : Here he is in the Sacrament vpon the Supposition, and you disdainfully deny him homage and veneration. This in a word is all I would say, and it is an vnanswerable Dilemma also.

*Antiswe-  
rable  
Dilemma.*

17. If you Accuse vs iustly, we are Idolaters, and were no Orthodox Church before Luther, if your Accusation be, as it is, most vniust, you Sin dampnably, you vchurch a pure Church and err fundamentally. I proue it. Who euer should Say this very houre: The pure Primitiue Church of the first Age was guilty of Idolatry, besides a damnable sin, err's fundamentally, For he makes a Church tainted with falshood, which God said was every way pure, And for that Reason contradict's Gods Veracity. You Sectaries lay the same foul Aspersiō on a Church, which the Supposition now makes pure and Orthodox, Therefore you sin dampnably, err fundamentally, and *vchurch your selues by it.*

18. I would willingly see this Dilemma Answered, and with all haue every Reader to take notice of a iust Iudgement of God fallen on Sectaries, whose whole labour hitherto hath been to charge error and Idolatry on vs, and the higher they went in such Accusations, the more they thought to destroy vs; neuer reflecting that in doing so, They haue done their vtmost to destroy all the Churches in the world by Calumnies, and Consequently to ruin Them selues; For most evidently if their was no true Church in the world before Luther, they are no members of it at this day, but miserably Churchles. Grant the first, the second is an ineuitable Consequence.

*A iust Iud-  
gement fal-  
len on  
Sectaries.*

## CHAP. V.

*A second Reason showing, That if the Roman Catholick Church erred but in one Article of Faith, there is now no Fundamental Faith in the world. VVere Error in this Church it is à remediless Evill and cannot bee amended by any, least of all by Protestants*

1. **S**OME as was said above may object. The Roman Catholick Church before Luther was right in à few fundamentals for She believed in God, in Christ, owned à Trinity &c. So far, and à little further perchance She may be reputed Orthodox, yet erred in other Matters which Sectaries desire to amend, and so to settle Christian Doctrin again on it's old foundations. Oblerue how I must labour to make that an Heretical Society vpon our Sectaries Supposition, which was and is the only true Church in the world; And therefore say. If our Church hath erred but in one only Matter of Christian belief, She is Traitorous, disloyal to Christ, and can be believed in nothing. To prove the Assertion, Suppose an Embassadour sent to à forraign State with this deep Charge, that he vtter nothing in his Princes name but so much only as he is commissioned to speak. Suppose again, the man declares some few truths to the state as his Lord commanded, But withall forges twenty other vntruths on his own head, and stilly affirm's his order is to deliuer all he saith in his Masters name. Would not such à man think ye be à Traitor vpon à double account? First because he exceed's the bound of his Commission and deliuers that he had no order for, But chiefly because he speaks vast falsities, wholly Contrary to his iudgement who sent him.

*The Church  
is traitorous  
iffalse in  
one Article.*

Disc. 2. C. 4. *There is no true Faith in the world.* 177

2. The Application in easy. The first Teachers of the Gospel were legates sent from God to a great State; the whole world, *For in omnem terram exiit sonus eorum.* They taught every where and well for some short time our Christian Verities, as the Prince who sent them Commanded, But their Successors, the Pastors and Doctors of the Roman Catholick Church in after Ages, had, Say Sectaries, the ill luck to miscarry, to turn Traitors, for, besides a few fundamental Truths upheld no man knowes how, They did not only exceed their commission in deliivering Doctrin to all Nations which Christ their Master neuer allowed of, but more over; forged of their own heads twenty vntruths. *Purgatory, Praying to Saints, Transubstantiation &c.* And spake all in their Princes name, Said also they had Commission from Christ to teach so. This fact, if the Charge be true, is Treasonable, they iniured Christ and his Verities and betrayed their trust; But a Church so perfidious cannot be Orthodox. Therefore if Sectaries do not Calumniate, Christ had no Orthodox Church in the world before Luther which I intended to proue, and Consequently Protestants are yet no true Church at all.

*And consequently not Orthodox.*

3. I say moreouer. If the Roman Catholick Church hath taught false Doctrin but in one onely Matter of Christian belief, She can be believed in nothing, yea I may rationally suspect her false in all She teaches. Iust so it is. If the book of Scripture deliuer's one Doctrin false which Christians now belieue, I cannot credit it in any thing. The reason is: One and the same Motiue of my belief duely and equally applied, euer moues to an equal Assent, or to None at all. For example. I belieue Christ dyed for vs, because Gods word saies so, Here is the Motiue of my Assent: I belieue also that he ascended into Heauen, because the same word of God speaks it, here is the same Motiue. Imagin now by a supposed impossibility, that this latter Article is Gods word, but false; I cannot belieue our Saviours Death vpon the Motiue of Gods word, For if this word be false and once deceiue, it may as easily be false and deceiue me twice, And there is no possible means to quit me of my error, Because whoeuer

*A Church false in one Article merits no belife.*

278 Disc. 2. C. 3. *If the Roman Church has erred*

endeauours to do that, is of less Authority than Gods word, which is now supposed to deceiue me. If therefore the First Verity can reueal an vntruth, none can belieue either man or Angel speaking of the high Mysteries of our Faith, and Consequently All must still remain in Errour.

4. Apply this Discourse to the Roman Catholick Church which pretend's at least (I say no more yet) to be Gods Oracle, and to speak in His name. She speaking in his name assures me, that Infants are to be Baptized, I belieue Her vpon her word: She also tells me, there is à Purgatory, but we must now suppose with Sectaries, it is à great vntruth, if so, I cannot possibly belieue Her in the other Doctrin of *Infant Baptism*. For if she deceiues me once She may well do it again, and which is to be noted, There is no means left vnder Heauen to vnbeuile me or to draw me out of my supposed Errour; for who euer attempts to do that, is of less Authority than my Church, which is supposed to teach, to err in Her teaching, and stiffly to maintain the Errour. Scripture cannot help here, vnless it be clear vpon an indubitable Principle, that the sense of it, and Doctrin of my Church can differ in points of Faith, which must be *proued*, and not *supposed*. If Fathers be alleaged Seemingly contrary to this known Doctrin, my duty is to explicate them, and rather to draw the Fathers to what the Church teaches than to renounce Her Authority, and adhere to the dubious and yet vnknown Sense of any Father.

*A Reflection  
for Sectaries.*

5. Now here is à short consideration For Sectaries. I said, whoever supposeth the Roman Catholick Church to haue erred, must ioyntly own it so remediless an Euil, that all the men on earth cannot help or remoue the supposed error from this Church. The reason is. All the Proofs and Principles (setting plain Scripture aside whereof there is no danger) which may be thought pertinent to impeach Her of error, will fall infinitely short and proue less ponderous, less substantial to perswade that She has erred, than her sole Vote, and own Authority (whilst she anathematizes the falshood) is to perswade the contrary. Viz. That

She

Disc. 2. C. 2. *There is no true Faith in the world.* 279

*she never erred.* Hence Sectaries, confessedly fallible men, who may easily spoil all they goe about to mend, adventure desperately to reform the Church, when the very Principles they should reform by (were there any such in being) are incomparably of less weight, strength and force than the Authority of this Church is, which faith She cannot erre. Howeuer She must be reformed (and here is the wonder) before they know whether She has erred, or haue the least assurance of their own half accomplish't reformation. Who then see's not, euery attempt made against our Church this way to bee, as really it is, à folly, an vnadvised Enterprise no less impossible, than in the highest manner improbable? Mark what à task lies on them.

*Sectaries  
Attempt  
desperately  
and why?*

6. First they are to proue She has erred, which was neuer yet done 2. To giue in Principles whereby they will reform. 3. To Shew themselues well settled in à perfect Reformation. 4. To euince that all those innumerable learned men of our Church from the Fourth to the present Age haue been stupidly blind, bereaued of iudgement and besotted with Errour. 5. Whereas other Christians both more aged and most learned espyed none of these Errours, They are to proue that God made choise of such vncommissioned men to perform à work so long neglected by the Orthodox world. But of these particulars enough is said in the other Treatise.

*What they  
are to proue*

7. Hence two things follow. First, that Sectaries only lose time, when by alleging à few dark Testimonies of the Fathers they offer to ouerthrow any Doctrin of our Church. Alas, what this Oracle positively defin's is à stronger Principle than twenty dubious Authorities of Fathers (if any such were) in appearance contrary. It followes. 2. That the Roman Catholick Church must of necessity be either owned Orthodox in all She teaches, or cannot be believed in any thing.

8. Wherefore I say à great word. If this Church hath de-  
ceiued the world in teaching à Purgatory, for example; *neither  
we nor Sectaries can certainly believe, that Christ was here on earth or  
descended &c.* For Ask, why believe wee this great Mystery? If you

*Answer*



280 Disc. 2. C. 3. *If the Roman Church has erred*

*One Error  
in the  
Church  
Destroys all  
Faith,*

Answer Scripture reueals it, you are Questioned again. How know you that Scripture is Gods word which *Ex verum* evidences not it self? You must Answer Vniuersal Tradition and all the Churches in the world haue owned the Book for Gods word. Very good. But The Church hitherto supposed most Orthodox, among so many Heretical Societies, and Her Tradition likewise haue actually deceiued all; For She is now Imagined to haue taught the false Doctrins of *Purgatory, Transubstantiation &c.* Therefore you cannot belieue Her, or any Tradition, for erring in one point of Faith, She is not belieuable in any (This principle stands firm) Much less can you trust to the Doctrine or Tradition of known Heretical Churches, whether *Arian, Pelagian* or others, For all these haue erred and most grossly, Therefore you haue no certainty of the verities contained in Scripture, nor can you belieue this one Prime Article. *Christ dyed for vs, by Divine Faith.*

9. Let therefore the Sectary labour all that's possible to contract the fundamentals of Faith into the shortest room Imaginable, let him mince them almost to nothing, let this one Article. *Jesus is the Christ* be Faith enough for all: I say if the *Roman Catholick Church* speaking in the name of God, as She pretends to speak, hath taught but one false Article, and obliged Christians to believe it vnder pain of damnation, (Purgatory for example) none can rely vpon any Motiue known to the world firmly believe That *Jesus is the Christ*. So pernicious, is one known error of the Church, that it ruins all belief of other Articles, nor can such a Church be more trusted in any thing She speaks, than Scripture relied on, were it false in that Article. *Jesus is the Christ.*

10. The reason *a Priori* is. All Faith is at last reduced, or finally resolved into Gods Diuine Reuelation, whether he speaks by this or that Instrument, by this or that Oracle, imports nothing. The difference of the Oracle he speaks by, *diuersifies not faith*, which alwaies tend's to one Center, and rests on one sure Ground, Gods Veracity. If he speaks by a Prophet that's his Oracle, If by an Apostle he is made an Oracle, If by the exterior words

*The Vltimate  
reason  
of the  
Assertion.*

Disc. 2. C. 5. *There is no true Faith in the world.* 281

of Scripture, they are Oracles, if by the Church, She is his Oracle, Now further. Suppose any of these assumed Oracles speaking in the name of God declare à false Doctrine to Christians, the Falsity ultimately redound's to God, who own's them as Oracles, yet by them teaches the world Falsities. It fall's out here; As if à Prince should send à Legate to à State who speak's in his name, and cheat the whole State by his Embassy: would not all deservedly upon the Supposition, more impute the Cheat to the Prince than to the Legate that speaks in his name? The parity is exact and proves, if either Scripture, Prophet, Apostle, or Church speaking in the name of God deliue's false Doctrine, God himself deceives us, and therefore *Rich. de s. Viâ.* Said well in this sense also. *si error est quem credimus &c.* If we believe an error, 'Tis you, Great God who haue deceived vs, But if God can once deceiue, either immediately By Himselfe, or mediately by his Oracle, The whole System of Christian Faith, is destroyed. What I say would bee true, Although He should make à solemn protestation of Speaking Truth, For euen then he cannot oblige me to believe, because he may deceiue in that very Protestation, and deliuer à falsity, if the supposition hold.

11. Here then is the final Conclusion. As *subiective* Faith in à Believer is Induisible, That is, it is either wholly good or wholly naught None can haue à piece of Faith without the whole vertue, (an Arian cannot believe Christ to be à Redeemer, if He denies the Trinity) So if one Matter of Faith proposed by the Church be really Contrary to what She defines, None can believe any thing She teaches, For, the meer Possibility of deceiuing Christians in one Article, impossibilitates the Belief of all She proposeth. And this proves the Church absolutely infallible not in some points only, but in all and every Doctrine, whereof you haue more in the, 15 16 and 17 Chapters following.

12. Some may reply. I suppose all this while the Church made so stedfastly God's Oracle as not to err in any Doctrine She proposeth, which is *Petuis Principy* or à begging of the Question. Contra. And Ye Gentlemen whilst you impeach

*Could the Church propose one false Article She can bee believed in nothing.*

282 Disc. 2. C. 5. *If the Roman Church has erred*

*God deceives  
if the  
Church  
can Err.*

Her of. Errour Suppose Her *Instrumentum diuulsum*, an Oracle come as it were, from Gods *Special Assistance*, iust as if I should Suppose the words of Scripture separated from the Spirit of truth. You suppose Her à fair sponse, yet make Her à harlot, when and as Often as you please. You acknowledge some Church, or other (find that out where you can) to teach Truth, yet you like petulant Schollers will forsooth be so wise, as to tell her where she misseeth in Her Lesson and correct Her for it; And you haue done it to the purpose, For you haue destroyed Her Monasteries, rob'd Her Altars, prophaned Her Temples, abused Her Children, banished some, and hang'd, vp other. Are not these fine Doings? *Contra.* 2. I suppose nothing but what is manifest, that Christ euer had à Church on earth (once more find it where you can) and that God speaks to Christians by this Oracle, which he will be with to the end of the world, And against which Hell gates shall neuer preuail. Now Hây, if this Church which God (not I) makes his own Oracle, and promises to teach Truth by it, can deceine but in one Matter of Faith, *God himself deceiues*, And this Church ceaseth *Eo ipso* to be *Catholick*, yea, and God to be the Eternal Truth. For it Matters nothing, if he can deceine, whether he do it by *Scripture*, or the Church. Solue this Argument if you can.

*The disparity  
between a  
priuate man  
erring, and  
the Church.*

13. You may say. 2. The whole ground of this Discomf à Fallacy and comes only to thus much. If à man once tell lie he must be thought à lyar in all he speaks. So it is. The Church speaks an vntruth in some things, *Ergo* it doth so, or may do so in all, seemes no good consequence. *Contra.* If an Embassadour once be found in an Vntruth when he speaks in his Princes name, I think few Monarchs or States will no more belieue him in like occasions, Than giue credit to one conuicted of periury when He swear's, vnless what he swear's bee proued true independently of his Oath. But let this pass. The disparity between a priuate man and the Church is most notorious. The First considered as one single and priuate, hath no Commission to speak in Gods name, or to teach the whole Christian world

what

Disc. 2. C. 5. *There is no true Faith in the world.* 283

what is, or what is not Christ's Doctrin; The Orthodox Church is impowred to do this, or to teach nothing, if then She err's but once, the Errour makes Her infamous, redound's to the Damage of all Christians seduced by Her, *yea and to God himselfe*, as is now declared. Hence I say the Church cannot teach truth by halves, as Sectaries would haue Her, or now Hit right, now mis. She cannot be Orthodox in a few main Matters called Fundamental, and erroneous in others. No. She is either Gods Vice-gerent in all She deliuer's as points of Faith, or in nothing. She must when she pretend's to speak in Gods name truly do so, or She cannot speak, nor pretend to speak, but must be silent. This Verity is further laid forth in the Chapters now cited, where we treat of the Churches Infallibility.

14. In the mean while, if any Should Obiect The Church vainly pretend's to be so far an Oracle of Truth, as not to impose on us false Doctrin And then demand, from whence She had this Priviledge of Infallibility? I Answer. Whoeuer trifles with such objections in this place, ( to be solued hereafter ) little vnderstand's the force of our Arguments. Mark I beseech you. It is now a supposed Principle ( Sectaries will haue it so ) that the Roman Catholick Church hath forged new Articles, and imposed the beliefe of them on Christians which God neuer Reuealed. Grant thus much, She iniures God, sin's damnably, And therefore is no Orthodox Church, But if She neither now be Orthodox, nor was so ten Ages before Luther, There was not then, nor is yet any true Christian Church in the world, *And consequently Protestants haue no Church.* The more erring Therefore they make the Roman Catholick Church, the more are they Churchlesse. This is what I Press and exprest at present, and would willingly haue my Argument solued.

15. There is yet an other Obiection scarce worth the paper, you shall haue it, such an one as it is. Protestants talk much of Papists Blindnes, And to free the Roman Church from damnable sin or formal Fundamental Errours, may perhaps say She hath indeed erred before Luther, and still is Idolatrous, But may be

*Whether any  
whole Dis  
course stand's*

*A weighty  
Obiection.*

284 Disc. 2. C. 4. *If the Roman Church has erred &c.*

*Touching  
upon the  
Ignorance  
of Catho-  
licks Solved.*

excused vpon the Account of *invinible Ignorance*. Answ. What's this? Do we hear talk of *invinible* ignorance in a whole learned Church? Pray, where shall we find knowledge if ignorance have place here? Such ignorance may perhaps be in some particular men, But to Tax a whole Church with it, is not only to make so many Councils, so many profound Doctors as haue taught the world worse than Idiots for a thousand years, but it is to inuile Christ, to tell Him he has indeed established a Church, yet mark'd it so obscurely, remoued it so far out of the Sight of Christians, that the most learned of all could not discouer the Truths it taught for ten long Ages, though all Antiquity Assures vs that Christ's Church is one of the most manifest things in the world. Again, Suppose our Church were blind and inculpably ignorant, who for Gods sake must open Her eyes now, and vnbeuile Her? Must a few late scattered Sectaries Doe the wonder, that are to look to their own *vincible ignorance*, And therefore (if learned) Sin vpon that account damnably. 3. If our Church may be excused vpon the score of ignorance, excuse also the *Arians* less learned, the *Pelagians*, the *Donatists* &c. And say there were neuer any formal sinful Hereticks in the world, yea Iewes, and Turkes may thus be acquitted of formal Sin, and Errour likewise. But aboue all free, I beseech you, our Sectaries from further pain-taking, as also from the least hope of amending Matters, were there any thing amiss, for you may well rest assured, if ignorance hath cast this learned Church into such an Abylse of Errour, it is not to be expected that the far weaker knowledge of Protestants, can draw Her out of it. I wonder men of Modesty dare offer to impute ignorance to the Roman Catholick Church, And presume to teach, more learned then Themselues.

## CHAP. VI.

*Other Evidences of the Roman Churches Perseverance in  
the Primitive Faith without change or Alteration.*

*Whether wickednes of life necessarily induceth  
Error into the Church? The Donatists and  
Protestants Argue, And Err alike.*

1. Argue. 2. God had ever a true Church preferred free  
from Error for so many Thousand years as passed between  
Adam and Christ. It stood all that vast time invincible against  
Heresy, and was never stained with false Doctrin. The Truth  
is indubitably owned by Christ our Lord, who came not to change  
so much as one iota of Doctrin taught by the Prophets, but only  
to perfect it by revealing other Verities, not explicitly known  
before. Now Mark a strange Paradox avouched by Sectaries.  
They say boldly, That our Christian Catholick Roman Church  
which certainly God Himselfe established, And enriched with his  
own Verities, only continued Orthodox for Three or Four Ages,  
and then (O disinal time) left off to be what it was; lost Christs  
revealed Truths, became the whore of Babylon, Apostated from  
it Selfe, and cheated the world into false Doctrin. What saies  
the prudent Reader? Is it Possible that the Ancient Church of  
the Patriarchs and Prophets stood without change or blemish for  
4. or 5. Thousand years, and Christ's own Spouse became smut-  
ched and vgly within the compass of three or 4. Ages? Is it  
Probable that the lesser light of the Synagogue lasted so long,  
And the Glorious sun of Christ's own Church, appeared dark  
and Eclipsed soon after The world had Cast an Eye vpon Her?  
And this, to encrease the wonder happened then (Sectaries must  
say)

*A second  
Argument*

*Drawn from  
a most im-  
probable  
Assertion of  
Sectaries.*



286 Disc 2. C. 6. *More of our Churches Continuance*

say) when evidently There was no other true Church on earth, unless you will take in *Arians*, *Pelagians* &c and such open Hereticks to make vp à Catholick Society, most vnfit (all know) to teach Christs Orthodox Doctrin. I wish Protestants would well ponder the force of this one reason, And return an Answer.

2. My last Argument is à Demonstration against Sectaries, who say. There was alwayes an Orthodox visible Church since Christs time: For this Article of our Creed was euer professedly true in all Ages. *I belieu the Holy Catholick Church.* They say again, There was à time when our Roman Catholick Church once Orthodox, began to innouate, to bring in new Doctrins of an *vnbloody sacrifice*, of *Transubstantiation*, of *praying for the Dead*, of *Purgatory* &c. Now be pleased to obserue the Demonstration. When the Roman Church began these new supposed Doctrins and actually erred, There was at that very time an other Orthodox Church in the world; *or was not*; If not; Christ had then no Orthodox Church on earth, and Consequently that Article of our Creed was false. *I belieu the Holy Catholick Church*, For no man can truly belieue in à Church which really is not. If contrarywise they own à pure Orthodox Church to haue been on earth when the Roman began to erre, *That* (because Orthodox and pure) was certainly à Society of Christians distinct from the then supposed fallen and false Church of Rome.

*An Argument  
against  
Sectaries.*

3. Hence I argue. Either that Orthodox distinct Church, sensible of Gods cause and the Honour of Christian Faith, vigorously opposed, censured and condemned those imagined errors of the Roman Church now fallen, or Carelessly let all alone, and omitted that Duty. If it omitted that duty, it was no true Church, For if true, Her Charge was and is, (She hath à command from Christ to do it) to crush, and suppress false Doctrins, when they first rise vp, or begin to infect the body of Christianity. This duty that Church neglected, and for that cause was not Orthodox. Moreouer, the Roman is alio Supposed actually drawn from Truth, Condemned Hereticks made vp no Church. We had then in those daies à strange world indeed, when Christ the Supreme Head

*Clear and  
Convincing.*

Head looked down from Heauen, and saw his Mystical body the Church pitifully Corrupted, when he cast an eye vpon poor Christians, and found them all Churchless.

4. If Sectaries own such an Orthodox Society, which opposed and censured the Roman Errours, that must be à Truth as *Notoriously known* to the world as it is now supposed, that the Church of Rome had Errours *Notoriously known*. And Here I desire the Iudicious Reader to reflect on what I Shall propose, And wish our Aduersaries to Answer. Can they Imagine the Errours of the Roman Church openly discovered so many Centuries since, and judge that no Orthodox Christians then liuing ( who beheld Truth run to ruin ) made Opposition against them ? The Errours, say Protestants, were palpable ( for our new men espy them now ) yet no Orthodox Christians are heard of to this day, who then stood vp for Gods cause, and defended the Ancient truths of Christ against this supposed erring Church, This yet lies in darkness. The Fault must be noised as both criminal and publick, And yet there is no newes at all of such as lent à helping hand to redress it.

5. Again, Can it be imagined that the Roman Catholick Church which Age after Age condemned innumerable Hereticks, And giues in an exact Catalogue in order as They rose vp, ( These particulars are exactly known ) And yet that no Author, Friend or Enemy Can bee found, who giues so much as the least hint of any sound Christians that condemned the now decryed Errours of this one Church ? Finally (and here is the wonder ) must we suppose our Church to haue grossly erred à thousand years since, when yet all good Christians were silent and reprehended it not, And that now after ten whole Ages are past, And Millions of Souls damned for want of Faith, A company of iarring Protestants Can probably begin to talk of them, to Reproue, to Argue, and offer to settle Christianity right vpon its old Foundations ? No thought of man can fall vpon more desperate improbabilities, yet they pass as current among Sectaries. But of this point more hereafter in the 13 Chapter.

*Sectaries  
Paradoxes  
and.*

*Vast improbabilities*

288 Disc. 2. C. 8. *More of our Churches Continuance*

*What Secta-  
ries are  
obliged to  
do, but  
cannot.*

6. Now here is the Conclusion, and the true Trial of this cause. It is possible that our new men, who pretend knowledge in Antiquity, name an Orthodox Church which openly Protested against these supposed Errours before Protestants were in Being. It is possible to tell vs when this Church strongly Acted against the Roman Errours. It is Possible to say what became of this Orthodox Church at last, whether after it had done that great work and Censured the Roman Doctrin, It quickly disappeared, Or still remain's in the world. It is I say, Possible, that Sectaries Euidence these particulars of most high Concern, or impossible, If the first can be done, we Catholicks ought to Reform. But I must vnbeguile the Reader, and absolutely Assert. All the Protestants who now are, or shall bee hereafter, Shall as soon destroy all Christian Faith as name any Orthodox Society, any thing like a true Church which censured these supposed Roman Errours, Therefore (And it is an euident Demonstration) Our Catholick Church once true, continued so in all Ages, Or there was none in the world Orthodox, The Articles She maintained then, and yet defend's are no Errours, but Primitiue Verities. And thus the whole Plea of our new men Concerning Errours entring the Church *de facto*, ends as it deserues in a flat Calumny. What do they think to bring Errours to light now, whereof the most learned Churches in the world neuer took notice before? Will they speak of false Doctrins when all Orthodox Societies said nothing of them? Dare they accuse and condemn a Church which Millions of Souls so highly reuerenced that the best of Christians liued and dyed happily in it? Nothing can be more exotical. Wherefore I say, when our Nouellists can work this Perswasion into mens minds, That Crowes once white, turned black in time (though no body must say when) Then, and not before, they may perhaps hope to make vs mad, and induce All to belieue, that our Church Anciently pure became tainted in time with gross Errours, though when or in what Age this deformity appeared they know not, nor Can euer know, because the Change is *de subiecto non supponente*, nor supposable.

*Their As-  
sumpt impos-  
sible.*

7. One may reply. Though the Sectary cannot point at an Orthodox Church which condemned these now Supposed Roman Errors, yet he has plenty of witnesses to ground his Assertion vpon, For in past Ages, many, though reputed Hereticks, vehemently decayed the Doctrins of our Church as *Novelties* Swerving from the primitive Truths. Answ: Very true indeed. For thus Arius of old decayed *Consubstantiality* and the Supreme Godhead in Christ, Pelagius, Original sin, The Monathelits two wills in our Saviour, Humane and Divine, Luther an vnbloody Sacrifice, And the Diuel after all, if you'l belieue him, will oppose every Truth which Christ taught. But what is all this to the purpose? which yet to my great wonder I find urged by some? In the Authority of these condemned and confessedly known Hereticks, precisely considered, to be parallell'd with a Church which was neuer condemned by Orthodox Christians? Must the condemned Party be heard when it Accuses, And the Innocent or neuer censured Church be Supposed guilty, after the whole world held her blameless and has iudged well of Her condemnations pas't vpon Hereticks? Compare I say, the Authority of the Church time out of mind proued Innocent, with the Authority of Hereticks known most guilty, There can be no Parallel, may we precisely respect Authority. Wherefore if the Opposition of Hereticks hath any force, Their charge against the Church must stand vpon Strong proofs and sound Principles distinct from *Their own voting Her Delinquent*. These Principles we seek for in all our Disputes with Protestants, yet hitherto neuer heard of Any, and belieue it, Wee hold their own Authority of no greater weight than that of Arians, or, of any other condemned Hereticks.

*The Votes of  
Adversaries  
without  
Proofs,  
weightless.*

8. Others, quite driuen off all ground of rational Arguing will needs fasten Errors vpon our Church, because, forsooth, in such an Age the 9.<sup>th</sup> For example after Christ, or The-reabout, some Popes were less good and People much debauched. Then, most likely, was the Nick of time, Say these, to bring in *Transubstantiation*, the Popes *Supremacy* and what other Error

*Another  
simple Plea.*

O o

you

290 Disc. 2. C. 6. *More of our Churches Continuance.*

you will. Answ. A most pitiful Plea, not worth the paper it blot's. I shall not so much refute it, for it merit's not the labour. As Shew how it destroyes the Belief of all Christian Religion.

9. Pray you consider Christianity in the greatest Latitude Imaginable. Call *Arians, Donatists, Protestants And Catholicks* all Christians. Grant, which is true, that there have been very wicked men amongst these different Professors. I say if this Argument haue weight. *Some few Popes, and many People were not good for one Age chiefly, Ergo debauchery in manners more then probably brought in false Doctrins vnder the Notion of Christian Truths, A Jew or Gentil may Argue as well, and infer that Viciousness of life hath destroyed all Truth among Christians, if euer They had any.* For why should lewdness haue less force to Subuert all Truth taught by the Church of Rome than some only? It hath, say Sectaries, brought in much Errour, Therefore, saith the Jew, it may as well haue corrupted all Christ Doctrin.

*violated and  
proued un-  
reasonable.*

10. To reinforce this Argument, I told you aboue, if the Church of Rome, had bur once proposed one Article to be believed by Diuine Faith, which is false, She is not to be credited in any thing. If you Reply, it is euident That though false in many Tenets, She yet taught some Articles true, As that *Christ is our Redeemer.* The Jew Answers, and so do I too, She Taught and teaches so still; but that *This is Truth*, if debauchery of life bee ineuitably connexed with false Doctrin, shall neuer be made Probable, For this Church is either entirely sound in Doctrin, or Entirely deluded. One may Say. Scripture is euidently plain for some Primary Articles of Christian belief. Answ. The Jew scorn's the Reply, and maintain's this Truth, as I also do. If it be once proued that the Church of Rome imposed on the Christian world Falshood in place of Truth, *Transubstantiation, The Sacrifice on the Altar &c.* She may as easily haue corrupted the whole Bible and made that Book false in a hundred important Passages, whereof enough is said in the other Treatise. No true Church Therefore, no Probability of true Scripture.

11. Let vs now proceed to others called Christians the most known

known Arch-hereticks, you will haue the same Conclusion. Arius for example, à stubborn proud Fellow had many Associates like Himself, yea and certainly taught some Doctrins false, Therefore, Saith the Jew, All He deliuered was false also. The Diuel learned Luther to broach His new Gospel, and the mans enormous Viciousness is known to the world by as credible Authors as *Platina* or *Nico: de Clemangis*, who make Popes and People so impious, Therefore all that Luther taught cannot but bee vpon the Argument proposed, most iustly excepted against as pernicious Doctrin; For gross Errours like à Torrent follow Deprauation in manners. Caluins Pride, Deceit, and Cousenage, to say nothing of that hidious Sin for which he was branded, are vpon Record, And all know what Rebellion, what tragical Doings ensued vpon the wicked mans Apostasy. Who then can harbour so much as à good thought of any Doctrin He taught euen that Christ dyed for vs? Hence, saith the Jew, if Wickednes of life and Errours in Doctrin be such inseparable Companions And all Sects or Religions nameable haue had Professors wicked, Farewel Christianity, yea and Christ Himself also. For, if the Impiety of some, lead's Erroneous Doctrins into à whole Moral Body, that one crying Sin of Iudas might more easily haue corrupted the First Apostolical Colledge final in Number, Than the incomparable lesse defects of Popes depraue the great Moral Body of the Church. O, but Christ secured the other Apostles from Errour. Answ. So he doth his Church, And the Jew will as soon belieue the one as the other, who Argues thus.

*An other Simple Argument, raised.*

12. Christianity was neuer without Sin, Ergo neuer without Errour, if the Argument haue force. When Therefore these new men Say Gods Providence seem's equally concerned to preferue the Church from things equally Pernicious (But viciousnes of life is as pernicious to Christianity, and as destructive to the End of it, as Errours in Doctrin) They know not what they Say. The Argument is euery way defectiue?

*Wickedness of life Compared with the loss of Faith.*

13. First its vtterly False, that Wickednes is so pernicious as Errours against Christian Doctrin, For Errours destroies Faith



292 Disc 2. C. 6. *More of our Churches Continuance*

the ground of Saluation, and immediately opposeth Gods *Infinite Veracuy*, Wickednes in Manners destroies Grace and other Supernatural virtues, yet leaues the Foundation vnshaken. Again. By what law do these men Suppose that God preserved not his Church Holy in those dayes? Doth it follow because some were wicked that She lost all Sanctity? Will they Say if the English Church had euer Sanctity in it, All vanished into Smoak in the late dissentions and deplorable Tumults? There were neuer such Doings at Rome in the worst of daies as England then Shewed to the world. O but there were then many Holy and Godly men that suffered. Be it so at present, I loue not to recriminate. For one of yours Holy, we had Thousands in that Age you except against the whole world ouer, in England Germany, Spain, France, Denmark &c. most humble, pious, virtuous and profoundly learned.. What do you think, that a few Abuses in Italy not half so bad as you make them, can *Unballow* an ample Church? Yet here lies the Strength of your weak Argument. The iniquity of some, chiefly of Popes and Prelates ruins not sanctity only, But moreouer induceth Error into the whole Moral Body of Christ. You iust proceed, as if One should attempt to proue that a goodly Building, which yet visibly stands fair to the Eye, and firm on Sure foundations, is all shattered and pulled down, because you can lead a man to the By-places of it and show him in it some Nastiness. The Instance is most Pertinent. You find filth Here and there in the fair House of God, and though there be more of it before your own doores, yet your Church must be supposed Holy and Orthodox, And ours contrarywise false and impious.

14. But I wonder nothing at this lame way of Arguing, *Leadeness of life in some* (not in all sorts of men as is vainly Supposed) *Vnsanctifies the Church, and bring's in Error &c.* For iust so Hereticks of old Argued against Catholicicks. Read *s. Austin*. Tom. 7.<sup>ad</sup> *litter Petiliani lib. 2.* Through his seuerall Chapters chiefly. Chap. 39. Petilianus objected as these men do, And I will Answer as *S. Austin* did. *There is no bitterness in honey, nor*

Particular  
Abuses can  
not unbal-  
low the  
Church

Sectaries  
argue like  
Hereticks  
of old.

dross with pure gold, Saith Petilianus. We Donatists are the purified gold, you Catholics full of bitternes and dross. &c. S. Austin Answer's. This is to Vapour like a mad man, And to proue nothing. *Attenda xrania.* Thou attends't to the Cockle only, and not to the wheat (As who should say though some be, yet all are not wicked) Thou considers't the Seed of the Enemy sowed in the world, and regards't not the seed of Abraham, in whom all Nations shall be blessed. *Quasi vero vos iam sin massa purgata.* Thou talks't as if ye, forsooth, were only the purged Mass of men, the sweet hony, the pure gold, the refined oyle, and none but you. It is not so. There is much naughtines among you, And the saint shewes wherein it was.

15. In like manner one might easily lay forth the lewdnes, the Hypocrisy of no few Sectaries were it not that S. Austin teaches vs to vse better Arguments, and therefore C. 32. Saith. *Pacificamur ergo &c.* Let vs agree on this. That thou neither Obiect to me our wicked men, nor I thine, to Thee. This bargain once made, thou wilt haue nothing to Say against that seed of Abraham, now diffused ouer all Nations. But Petilianus, I shall press thee with an insoluable Argument, and Ask, Why yee Donatists haue impiously separated your Selus from the seed of Abraham, or that Catholick Church wherein all Nations are blessed? And thus we vrge Protestants.

*How S. Austin argues against the Donatists.*

16. Again. Chap. 51. Petilianus obiected. Ye Catholicks lay Claim to S. Peters Chaire the See of Rome, I call that, saith he, in the words of the Prophet, *Cathedram pestilentia.* The See of pestilence. And do not Protestants speak thus irreuerently of the Roman Chaire and Church also? Both Argue alike. S. Austin Answers. *Hac non videt?* Dost not thou see that all thou alleges't here is a meer lying Calumny? For though thou may reproach some, yet all are not guilty of the Crimes imputed to them. I will auouch more. Adds the Saint. *Si omnes per totum orbem tales essent quales vanissimè Criminari &c.* If all the Bishops the whole World ouer were as bad as thou fanciest, what wrong hath the Chair of S. Peter, or the Church either, done thee? If thou perswade thy Self, that those who deliuer the law, do not exactly comply with it,

294 Dis. 2. C. 6. *More of our Churches Continuance*

know, that our Lord Iesus speaking of the Pharisees, long since silenced thee. *Dicunt & non faciunt.* They say but do not. If then thou wouldst diffame either Church or See, because men in works are not answerable to their words, thou knowest not what to say but only to reproach without Reason. Thus and much more Blessed *s. Austin*, and He ouerthrowes our Aduersaries whole Plea by it. Though I verily hold them no such strangers to common reason, but that they saw well the Argument already proposed enormously impertinent, to proue either the See of Rome or that Church impious or erroneous in Doctrine.

*The Sallary  
Cannot but  
see his Argu-  
ment void of  
force.*

17. The true Reason of foysting in such simple stuff, is an itching to Cauil, because they can not closely dispute against Catholick Doctrin vpon rational Principles, hauing none to yrge against vs. What remains but to scratch (it is a late strain got in among them) and to rub vpon old soares, the personal defects of others abroad, whilst God knowes, they haue more festered wounds to look on and launce in their own Brethern at home! Thus I say, they must nip and taunt or write no more Controuerfies, Though it is done to their own Confusion, For suppose all were true which is said of lewd and wicked men in the Church (as in real Truth the half is not) yet the impiety of these men neuer came to that height as to make vpon such Cauils, the pure Spouse of Christ a Harlot, on Frontlesly to impeach Her of Errour, or quite to desert Her as our Nouellists haue done most shamefully. No: Though wicked, they know well, that Cockle growes vp in the same field with good Corn, and that the Sin of some may stand with the Sanctity of many in the Mystical body of Christ. The Haruest, as the Gospel, and *s. Austin* teach, is to Winnow all, and to Make the Separation. But enough and more then enough of this slight and forceless Obiection.

*Why sell a-  
ries bring to  
light such  
simple  
stuffs.*

18. I haue yet one word to say of errours wrongfully Charged on vs. Were this Supposition true that the Roman Catholick Church had Apostated so shamefully in any Age, as Sectaries Imagine, Had She been made of a beautiful Spouse a harlot, Had She

She fallen from the primitive Truths into false Doctrine; And consequently Cheated Christians into Falsities for a thousand years together. Christ Jesus our Lord had been obliged by virtue of his promise already made in Scripture to have appeared Again, To have sent an Angel from Heaven, Or to have used some other extraordinary means to establish his Church a new, to raise up the walls of his now Supposed ruined Hierusalem, which he built so slightly, that it all fell down in the short Compass of three or four Ages. I say all, For, if the Church be false in one Article, I can crush it in nothing. The Promises in Scripture of Hell gates not prevailing against the Church, of Christ's Being with Her to the end of the world, are manifest; Yet now upon the Supposition, Hell and Heresy have destroyed the whole Building, and He Blessed Lord, look'd on, saw his own work defaced, yet after all his Engagements of preserving it in Being, repaired nothing. These are harsh Heretical Paradoxes unfit for Christians to hear, yet the Sectary (will be still he) must own them to his Confusion.

*A Reflection  
for Sectaries.*

19. To establish more this great Truth, That the Doctrine of our Church is at this day the same with the Primitive; I might well Argue from the Confession of our Adversaries, Luther Christy and Calvin, who grant so much in many particulars, As that of Merit, of Free Will, Limbus Patrum &c. But withall say Antiquity erred no less than we do now, And therefore Calvin professeth he followes none of the Fathers but *s. Augustin*, Though when He pleases, he is too bold with the Saint and scornfully rejects his Authority also. See Bellar. *de notis ecclesie lib. 2. Cap. 3.* I might also show that our Sectaries Novelties, for the greatest part, are nothing els but a List of old long since dispersed and condemned Heresies now brought to light again, and knit together in one bundle to poison the world withall. They have renewed the Heresy of the Donatists, who taught that the Church of God had perished throughout the world except in some few obscure Corners. They renew the Heresy of the *Arrians* teaching it unlawful to offer Sacrifice for the dead. They

*What Secta-  
ries Novelties  
are.*

renew

renew the Heresy of the *Eunomians*, saying that by Faith only man may obtain life Everlasting. You haue with These men the Heresy of the *Iconomachians* in breaking down the Images of Christ our Lord and His Saints, reuiued again. Of the *Sorcerians* denying the true Body and blood of our Lord Iesus Christ really present in the Eucharist, as likewise of the *Vigilantians* that slighted the Inuocation of Saints, denying Honour due to the Relicks of holy Martyrs. But I need not to insist vpon these and many more reuiued Heresies, they are things Vulgarly known to all, largely laid forth in the writings of our Catholick Authors. See Bellar: now Cited.

## CHAP. VII.

*Manifest and most vnderiable Miracles peculiar  
to the Roman Catholick Church only, prone  
Her Orthodox, withall show that  
She still retain's the Primi-  
tue Doctrin.*

1. **B**Y this word *Miracle*, or *Miracles*, I vnderstand a Supernatural work done by Almighty God aboue the power and force of Nature. For there is no doubt, but that God, who created Nature, has within his boundles Omnipotency Supereminent effects of Grace, which far surpass the little *Might* of all Creatures made by him. These are finite; The Author of them infinite, And can do more.

*What is  
meant by  
Miracles,*

*Why Mira-  
cles are  
wrought.*

2. 2. This Principle is certain. God hath wrought innumerable Miracles, not only to Testify He can do more then Nature, but with this express Designe also, that by the Manifestation of such wonders, All may come to the knowledge of those  
Oracles

Oracles whereby He speaks, and Reveals most sublime Mysteries far above the reach of our weak Reason. Now whether these Oracles be Prophets, Church, or Apostles, seems one and the same thing, if they be equally Manifested by miraculous Effects, and speak in his name who Assumes them to teach the world.

3. I say manifested Oracles by Signes; And say it for this End, That all may reflect vpon the depth of Diuine wisdom, which may on the one side Seem too rigorous in obliging vs to belieue most Difficult Mysteries, neither seen by Eye nor heard by eare, Were it not; That on the other side, the burden is lessened and our Faith much facilitated by the Euidence of most prudent and conuincing Motiues, For tis a great Truth. *Non sine testimonio reliquit Semeipsum benefaciens de Celo.* His Goodnes so fauorably condescends to our weaknes, that though he remooues not Vnclerstanding and Obscurity from the Mysteries belieued, Yet he makes them all so evidently Credible to prudent Reason (*Benefaciens de Celo*) by the Lustre of Signes and Wonders, That the man who belieues not after a Sight had of such glorious Marks, stand's guilty before Gods Tribunal of damnable Sin.

*They facilitate Faith.*

4. The third Principle. Miracles eminently great in number and quality (for example the raising of the dead to life) Chiefly, when wrought by Persons of Singular virtue to Confirm our Christian Faith, are from God, and euident Signes leading to the knowledge of true Religion. None can doubt of the Assertion, seing Christ our Mord. *Matt. 11.* When Questioned whether He was the true Messias, proued the Affirmatiue by his Signal Miracles. *The blind see, the lame walk, Lepers are Cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead rise again &c.* Which is to say in other Terms. These wonders speak in my behalfe, and plainly Testify that I am the Messias; For only to say, I am a Prophet sent from God without prouing the Truth to Reason by Signes and wonders Conuincies nothing, Induces none to Belieue. Therefore *Iohn. 10.* Christ remitted the vbelieuing Iewes not to the Euidence of his Doctrin, (for really no Doctrin of Mysteries about Reason, though most true, is or can be its own Self-eu-

*And lead to the knowledge of true Religion.*



*Our Saviour  
pleaded by  
his Miracles.*

*They were  
Signes of  
Pauls apost.  
leship.*

*Why the  
Jewes were  
saxed of  
Incredulity?*

dence) But to his manifest Miracles. *The Works which I do in the name of my Father, These giue Testimony of me.* Again. *If ye will not believe me believe my Works.* Blessed S. Paul might have Long preached the Sublime Doctrin of Christ, and without Fruit, vnless Miracles had confirmed it, which he call's the *signes of his Apostleship.* 1. Cor. 12. And How long think ye would Nabuchodonozzer haue remained in his Idolatry vnless He had beheld that prodigious Wonder wrought by God vpon the three Israelites in the fiery Fournace. *Daniel 3.* But when he saw them walk in the flames nothing hurt, He cryed out. *Blessed be the God of Sydrack Misack and Abdenago, who hath sent his Angel &c.* Miracles therefore are powerful Inducements to Beliefe, which Truth might be yet more largely demonstrated by the Wonders of Moses, of Elias of the Prophets and Apostles, But these I waue and briefly take notice of our Saviours sacred words Iohn 15. *If I had not come and spoken to them, they should not haue sinned, but now they haue no excuse of their sin &c.* And to show, that *speaking* only was no sufficient Conuiction, The Text add's. *If I had not done among them Works which no other man hath don, they should not haue sinned but now they haue sinned, and hate me, and my Father &c.*

5. Three things follow from hence. First That eminent Miracles of their own Nature are Marks of Christ's Doctrin and true Religion. 2. That Our Saviour most iustly condemned the Jewes of infidelity, not so much for reiecting his word or Preaching, as for not believing after they had seen it confirmed by Wonder's from Heauen, For t'is Said plainly. *Had they not seen they had not sinned.* A Doctrin Therefore attested by Miraculous signes, and wonders renders the Vnbelleiuer guilty of Infidelity: Consider it alone, deuic'd of such Marks, what haue we? High Mysteries preached, But Without Proofs antecedently laid forth to Reason; Truths taught, but yet vknown whether so or otherwise. In a word we haue the Decree of a great Monarch obliging all to submission, but without his seal, or Signature.

6. And

Disc. 2. C. 7. *Our Catholick Church, Orthodox.* 299

And Hence it is that our blessed Lord impowred those first great Masters of the Gospel *Matt. 10.* not only to teach his Sacred Verities, but to teach *Persuasively*, by the vertue of Miracles. *Go and preach, saying the Kingdome of God is at hand, Cure the sick, raise up the dead, cleanse the Lepers, Cast out Devils &c.* And they did so. *Mark 16. 20.* They Went abroad, preached every where, God Cooperating with them, and confirming their Doctrine by Signs which followed, Or to speak in the words of S. Paul. *Heb. 2. God withall Testifying by Signs and Wonders and diuers Miracles &c.* A third sequelle. If the Jewes had not sinned by reiecting Christ and his Doctrine (which then was new) in case he had not wrought greater Miracles amongst them than euer Any did before him, How highly imprudent think ye, How notoriously culpable are our Sectaries who believe the new opinions of one wretched Luther or Caluin, without so much as one Miracle wrought, to make them probable?

*Why Sectaries are blameable?*

A fourth Principle. True Real Miracles are Still necessary in the Church and fortold to be so, by Truth it self. *Isa. 12. Amen, Amen, I say vnto you, he that belieues in me, the Works which I doe he shall doe, and greater Works than these shall he doe. I say purposely, True real Miracles,* mindful of S. Chrysostome's profound Discourse vpon these very words in his Book against the Gentils. *There haue been, saith the Saint certain Masters (you may call them Impostors) who had their Disciples and talk't much of Wonders whilst they liued; but none of them euer came to the impudency as truly to Prophecy of Miracles to be done by them after death. No: A Iugler may do something strange, whilst he is on the Stage, But take him off the Theater, Throwe him out of this life, The cheat appears, He is worth nothing.*

*S. Chrysostome excellent Resolution.*

All is contrary in our Sauour, who here foretold of greater Wonders to be wrought in after Ages by his true Belieuers, Than He had done in this Mortal life. And if we Speak of great Conuersions (which all most iustly account Miraculous) the Truth is Euident, For our Blessed Lord conuerted but few, in Comparison of those who followed in the Church after his Death.

*The Apostles wrought the greatest Miracles after Christ's Ascension.*

(A parallel of other Miracles we shall see presently). Yet more. And 'tis worth Reflection, whilst Christs Disciples conversed with Him, the Gospel record's little of their Miracles. But after his leaving this world Signes followed them. *They cast out Devils, raised the dead, spake with new tongues,* conuerted Nations, laid hand on the Sick, &c. And the like Supernatural effects have been visible in the Church through all Ages after the Apostles. So true are the words of Christ. *Greater Things shall be done.* And the meaning is not, that every true Believer should work Miracles, (For so Christs promise would not bee truly fulfilled, *because All do them not*) But that some choise elected of his Church, as it happened in the Primitiue times, Members of this Mystical Body, should haue the Priuiledge.

*Why Miracles are now Necessary?*

9. One Reason of my Assertion is. If Miracles, Gods own Seals and Characters, were Necessary at the first preaching of the Gospel to induce all to believe Christs Doctrine, or to distinguish his Truths from the Errours of Iewes and Pagans, The like Necessity is for their Continuance in after Ages, not only in respect of Infidels, but erring Christians also. For, no sooner had Christ founded his Church, But the Diuel raised vp his Chappel by it, Pestiferous Hereticks from Simon Magus, have been in every Age his Chaplins. All of them Pretended to Truth, with an *Eccle his est Christum*, Loe we preach Christ in this Confusion of Sects, it was absolutely needful, to Mark out that happy Christian Society which taught sauing Faith and Shewed where God was adored in Spirit and Truth. Now no Mark can be more Palpable or more attractive, than the Glory of indubitable Miracles, Christs own Cognisances, and the clearest Euidences of Apostolical Doctrine.

*Two other Reasons alleged.*

10. 2. Miracles are necessary in the Church to stir up Christian Faith, and Devotion with it, which would soon grow cold, were it not that Diuine Providence frequently quickens both, by these exterior Signes and wonders. Wherefore, as His Goodnes works inwardly and pleyes our hearts with Grace, so outwardly also (to Testify that nothing is wanting) He moues vs to Believe

## Disc. 2. C. 7. Our Catholick Church, Orthodox 301

by no less visible Inducements than Those were, which first made the world Christian.

11. 3. The Continuation of Miracles Clearly appeared in the first five Centuries after Christ, And as Authority makes them indubitable, So reason also proves them necessary vpon this very Account, that the Conversion of Infidels strangers to Christ, was not wrought on a suddain, or all at once, But successively Age after Age, If then Miracles were necessary to convince our Christian Verities when Christ and his Apostles first preached to unbelieving Jewes and Gentils, no man can probably iudge them Vileless in after Ages, when the like Barbarous, the like Ignorant and vncivilized Nations who neuer heard of Christ or Scripture became Christians, Induced, to so happy a change, not because they heard truths Taught, But because they saw all confirmed by Evident Signes and Wonders.

12. Reflect I beseech you a little. Were not the Natiues of those vast and remote Regions we call the Indies (whether Orient or Occident) a People as ignorant of our Christian verities and as much auerted from Christs Doctin, when S. Francis Xauierius, and other laborious Missioners first preached There, as any Nations were to whom the Apostles preached Christ? Yes most certainly. In both cases the disdain and ignorance may well be paralleled. Imagin now that S. Xauierius had only opened his Bible; And told the ruder People of the high Mysteries of Christian Faith, would this think ye, though neuer so speciously laid forth, haue gained credit? No. But when their eyes beheld Miracles, and glorious Miracles accompanying His laborious Preaching; The deaf, dumb, blind, and sick instantly cured. When they saw the Sanctity, the Austerity and Innocency of His virtuous Life. When they heard him indued with the Gifts of tongues. When they knew that after a noble contempt of the world, The blessed man sought nothing but God, And fearing neither death nor dangers Couragiously travelled from one end of the world to the other &c. Then it was they began to look about them, to open their eyes more, to Renounce Idolatry, and sub-

One Reason  
further illu-  
strated

By an In-  
stance of  
Missioners  
sent to  
preach

mit to Gods truths, most manifestly evidenced by glorious Miracles. Then it was that the Saint ( Gods grace concurring ) converted Thousands and Thousands, All which is vpon certain Record, and witnessed by those who haue written the wonder. Howeuer grant that s. *Xauerius* wrought but one or two Miracles ( when many more cannot without impudency be denyed him ) our Assertion sublists, that Miracles are necessary, for the reclaiming of Infidels, And if he did none at all, This as *S. Austin* anciently obserued vpon à like occasion, is the greatest Wonder of all, That he conuerted innumerable Heathens to our Christian Faith, without Miracles.

## CHAP. VIII.

*Miracles eident in the Roman Catholick Church, No less induce All now to belieue Her Doctrin, Than Apostolical Miracles Anciently Perswaded to belieue that Primitiue Doctrin. The Denial of Miracles Impossibilitat's The Conuerſion of Iewes and Infidels.*

1. **I** I say first. Clear and Vnquestionable Miracles, of the like Quality with those which Christ and his Apostles wrought, haue been euer since, most gloriously manifest in the Roman Catholick Church, And in no other Society of Christians, I hope none for Proof of my Assertion can expect that I write Volumes, or bring to light again in this short Treatise so much as the hundred Part of those prodigious wonders which are vpon Record in the liues of Saints, in the death of Martyrs, and Ecclesiastical History. Baronius large Tomes giue you innumerable

memorable in every Century, And Bellar: Lib 4. de notis Ecclē: C. 14. Hitt's at a few from the first Age to the 15. I must wane this longer work, and briefly Argue thus.

2. Christ Spake Truth in the Text now cited. John 14. 12. *Propheſing of future glorious Miracles to be wrought by thoſe who be- lieved in him.* But the indubitable Miracles wrought in the Ro- man Catholick Church *only*, through every age prove that Pro- phesy exactly fulfilled, or *effectually* Evidence the Verity of it; Therefore none can doubt of Miracles done in the Roman Ca- tholick Church, if Christs Prediction be true, and this Proposi- tion be also proved. viz. That, This Church only, hath effect- ually manifested the truth of that Prophecy, or shewn such Wonders as haue proportion with Christs own glorious works, and the Apostles.

*Indubitable  
Miracles  
evinced  
Christs Pro-  
phesy fulfil-  
led.*

3. Now to clear the Truth, Here is my Principle. When I read a Prophecy in Scripture, I submit to it by Faith, but when I see it actually Accomplished or made manifest by real visible Effects And both Sense and vndoubted History discover so much evidently, Reason, grounded on Sense and History, Can not but prudently assent to the Verity. What I would say is clear in all the Ancient Prophecies of Christ, and his Church. Take this one instance. The Prophets, *Daniel* chiefly and *Ezay*, Foretold of the large Extent of Christs glorious Kingdom here on earth, of whole Nations flocking to his Church, of Her teaching those Truths which were believed from the Beginning; But when all *saw* with their eyes innumerable Heathens gained to our Christian Faith, and heard of other Conversions conveyed to them vpon certain Relation (for few or none of vs saw the latter Conver- sions wrought in *China*, *Japan*, and the like remote places) when I say Authority neuer Questioned giues vs certainty hereof, *then all bless God, And conclude*, That what the Prophets foretold of great Conversions, hath been visibly fulfilled; And that Christs Church is dayly more and more enlarged, Answerable to those Predictions.

*The Princ-  
ple whereon,  
our Assertion  
is grounded.*

4. Hence I discourse further, and Assert, that the glorious  
Miracles



304 Disc. 2. C. 8. Of what weight Miracles are

Miracles which stand vpon indubitable Record, and haue been done in the Roman Church only, most notoriously Euidence without Dispute the actual Accomplishment of our Saviours own words. *The Works which I do, he shall do also and greater than these shall he do.* If you Ask how I proue the Assertion? I appeal to Sense and certain History. Sense first saw these Miracles done, and certain History which Supplies the want of Sense, conueyes them to vs, though innumerable are liuing at this Hour, who haue been eye Witnesses of Miracles. Now here we might enter vpon a long work and Recount what the Fathers and Historians both ancient and latter, haue of this Subiect. Read if you please these few.

Fathers,  
produced  
witnesses of  
Miracles.

5. *Irenaeus* Bishop and Martyr who liued about the year 180. lib: 2. Cap. 57. And saies. The number of these Diuine works which God hath manifested in his Church the whole world ouer, are numberles. A little before, He mentions these particulars. *Some cast out Diuels, other Prophecy, others lay their hands on the sick and cure them; yea and raise vp the dead, who liued with n for many years.* *Tertullian* of the second Age Lib. ad Scapal: ad *Euseb.* lib. 5. giue you a large Catalogue of most glorious Miracles. The like doth *S. Basil.* Lib. de Spir: S. Speaking of this worthy Bishop of *Neocæsarea.* *S. Gregory*, deservedly called *Thaumaturgus*, for the wonders he wrought. *S. Athanasius* and *S. Hierome* relate the Miracles of *S. Hilarion*, *S. Martin*, And the same *Hierome.* Lib. aduersus *Vigilantium* c. 4. Saith that the Signes and wonders manifested in the Temples of Martyrs proue mightily beneficial, both to Belieuers and the Incredulous. *Responds* (they are his words) *Quomodo in Vilißimo palatris &c.* Answer, *Vigilantius*, how it is that we see such Signes and virtue present in a little vnualuable dust, and dead mens ashes? *S. Ambrose*, an Eye-witness of Miracles wrought by the Reliques of *S. Gervasius* and *Prothasius* Epist. 85. for proof of them, Appeals to Sense and the Iudgement of others. *You haue known, saith he, Nay you haue seen many dispossessed of Diuels, many when they touched the garments of Saints, freed from their infirmitis &c.* *S. Austin* Lib. 22. de Ciuit: C. 8. &

S. Hieromes  
words.

S. Ambrose  
an eye wit-  
ness,

c. 8. & 9. Is large in relating the Miracles wrought by the glorious Martyr *S. Stephen*; And *Lib. Contra. Epist. Fundam. C. 4. 5.* Saith, That the true Church of Christ is proued and demonstrated by Miracles. Our Venerable *Bede* a great Scholler, a worthy vertuous man, And highly esteemed the whole Christian world ouer, certainly deserues credit, when *Lib. 4. Histor.* He recount's the Miracles of the glorious *S. Cuthbert* Bishop of Lindesferm and of others within our England. Are any such seen now a dayes wrought by Protestant Bishops? No God knowes, Their new Faith is a great stranger to all old Miracles,

*S. Austins  
Euidence.*

6. Fall if you please lower and read *S. Bernard* in the life of *S. Malachy* a worthy Bishop of Ireland, what wonders haue we there? The ancient Miracles of the Church, Saith *S. Bernard*, were apparently, manifest in *S. Malachy*. He had the gift of Prophecy, Cured the Sick, changed the minds of men to the better, and raised up the dead. Now if you will hear of *S. Bernards* own Miracles, Read *Godfridus* who liued with him. *Lib. 4. C. 4.* and wrote His life, you haue innumerable. Tis hard, saith *Bellarmin*, to Recount all, And as numberles are the known Miracles of those two admirable, Saints Blessed *S. Dominick* and the Seraphical *S. Francis*, Founders of two most glorious Religious Orders. *S. Francis*, To omit his other certain wonders, was Himself a Miracle of Austerity and Pennance. The like was *S. Dominick*, who as we read in his life raised three dead men to life, And for three you haue more reuiued by an other of His holy Order, I mean that admirable Saint *Vincentius Ferrerius*. So the pious and learned *S. Antoninus* Arch-Bishop of Florence Recounts in his Hist'ry. 3. Part lib. 23. And who dares say that so great a Doctor And most modest Prelate, was so Frontless as to write that we read, not long after the death of *S. Vincentius*, without Assurance and Certainty. The whole world would haue decryed the Folly, Had it been a Fourb, an Imposture; or a fabulous Story.

*S. Bernard  
in the Life  
of S. Malachy.*

7. By what is now said of These and other infinit Operations of grace which I am forced to omit, you may infer first, That the Miracles wrought in the Roman Catholick Church are not

*Our Sa-  
viours Pro-  
phesy fulfil-  
led in the  
Churches  
Miracles.*

*Miracles  
made Credi-  
ble upon hu-  
mane Au-  
thority.*

inferiour to those done by the Apostles, And consequently if our Saviours Prophecy was seen manifestly fulfilled in those first Apostolical Wonders, it hath been also as effectually accomplished in these latter of the Church. I say, in the Roman Catholick Church, For all those now named, whom God priuiledged with the Grace of working Miracles, were of the same vnion in Faith with this Church, and no other. It followes. 2. That Humane Faith, when no iust Exception comes against it, But the fool-hardy Spirit of vnbelieuing Heathens and Hereticks, giues Mortal Assurance of Miracles. The Miracles of our Saviour euidence this Truth. He raised Lazarus from death. *Iohn 11.* A Touch of his garment cured the infirm woman. *Matt. 9.* He restored sight to a blind man. *Iohn. 9.* Obserue I beseech you. All Iewry beheld not these Wonders, But some only, Yet they were wrought for the good of All, and without doubt proued conuincing Arguments of Christ's great power to innumerable, who actually saw them not, But only heard of them, and Assented to what they heard, vpon humane Authority prudently credible. Therefore our Saviour Supposed That humane Faith ( and this before the writing of Scripture ) was à Sufficient Means to conuey to others à Moral certainty of his Miracles. I say yet more. If God euer efficaciously intended to worck à true Miracle since the Creation of the world by any of his creatures, Humane Faith was, and yet is the Fast and most Connatural way of Conueying it to the knowledge of others. Who therefore excepts against this vsual course of Providence destroies à Principle of Nature, and can belieue nothing of Supernatural Effects, but what he either sees with his own eyes, or find's registred in Holy Writ.

8. Ask now. How many *Austins*, How many *Chrysostoms*, how many *Cyrills*, how many *Bedes* and *Bernards*, haue vpon their Credit, and Reputation assured vs of Miracles wrought in the Roman Church only, like to those in the Primitiue Age? They are numberless. Did Christ our Lord restore life to the dead, sight to the blind, health to the sick? The Professors of our Catholick Church, by his virtue, haue done the very same, and the

the Miracles are more numerous. But now, and here is the chief demand. Were our Saviours glorious Works made Credible to thousands no Eye-witnesses vpon Humane faith and Authority, before Scripture registred them? So it is. Behold we haue our *Austins*, our *Iustins*, our *Basils*, our *Bernards* vnexceptionably plain for the Churches Miracles, and none can without Impudency, and the violation of all humane Credit, probably Cauil at what these haue written. None can without making very Saints Impostors and guilty of that enormous sin of grossly deceiuing Posterity, pure away so much as any substantial parcel of what is Recorded. Therefore vnless all humane Faith perish, its desperate rashness to deny most glorious Miracles to haue been in the Roman Catholick Church, which was my Assertion.

Authority  
alleged.

9. And to confirm it more. I Ask why do Sectaries to disgrace our Miracles, introduce, I know not what Stories of the Heathens wonders? Are these credible or no? If not, reiect them boldly as Impertinences; If Credible, it seems humane Faith is of some weight with Sectaries when they read of the Heathens fopperies, though of no Account for true Miracles wrought by the Church of Christ. Again, this Faith is much worth with these men, when to lay à foul Asperision on à Pope or Prelate, they fill their Books with à hundred petty Stories, whether true or false imports little. Herein their easy Beliefe swallows all, But if à Father or Choise Historian mention à Miracle, its à *Fourth*, à *dream*, à *fiction*, and what not.

Sectaries in  
Consequen-  
ces.

10. One word more and I end. A meer pretended Humane Authority, which really is not, And therefore nothing worth, is shamefully made vse of to patronize that crying Sin of Sectaries Schism. Our Church, Say they, Changed Her ancient Faith, the Charge at most relies on History or Humane Faith, God neuer told them so. For example. The Lateran Council first brought in the Doctrin of *Transubstantiation*, some Pope or other first invented Purgatory &c. Suppose all this were as true, as t's hideously false, History or nothing must make it good, and yet in our present case it is no warrant for known Miracles. Thus

368 Dis. 7. C. 8. Of what weight Miracles are

Faith riseth and fall's in value as our New mens fancy pleases. Belieue it, had blessed S. Ambrose (cited aboue), in lieu of that Miraculous Cure wrought on à blind man at Millan, when Himself was present (and innumerable of that Citty saw the wonder) related à story preiudicial to either Pope or Clergy, How often think you would that haue been told and reiterated in the Writings of Sectaries? But now when Hee speaks of à supernatural Work of grace, done at the Reliques of the holy Martyrs Gervasius and Protasius, not à word is said. No, all passes in Silence, as if Christs own Marks and the Churches glory (vndoubted Miracles) deserued no Memory, but Contrarywise Scorn and contempt.

Humane  
Faith now  
Valuable  
now not  
with *Sectaries*.

11. I said in the Assertion, that the grace of true Miracles, (meaning such as exactly Answer to our Sauours glorious works) is proper and peculiar to the Roman Church only. The proof hereof is easy: First, Sectaries pretend not to work Miracles, For they say, that power ceased long since, though I might here mind them of Caluins great wonder, and really it was à strange one, For whereas Gods Saints restored life to the dead, this great Sinner, hauing perswaded one *Bruleus* of Ostun to fain himself dead, deprived the poor wretch of his life Or, rather God to lay open the fraud and Hypocrisy of both the one and other, turned the *Fiction* into à *Verity*, for really *Bruleus* who Counterfeited himself dead, to get *Caluin* the renown of working Miracles, was after all the Ministers long prayer, found dead indeed. The story is known and writ not only by *Hierome Bolsci* in *Vita Calvini*. C. 13. But by others also. And here I wish Sectaries to giue some credit to humane Authority.

*Caluins*  
*Miracle.*

12. Now as Protestants disclaim Miracles, so do the Iewes also, for they neuer had any after our Sauours Comming. This true, that Pond vpon *Probatice*. *Iohn*. 5. Or as many will haue it, the Pond it self, so called because the Sheep ordained to Sacrifice were washed there, continued Miraculous, whilst Christ our Lord preached, But soon after ceased, And so do all other wonders amongst that abandoned People. The Turks who say.  
God

*Sectaries*  
*Jewes and*  
*Turks dis-*  
*claim Mira-*  
*cles.*

God gave Mahomet the sword and Christ the Power of working Miracles, pretend to no such supernatural effects at all. No more in Justice can Heathens or the Donatists lay Claim to any, whose wonders were but trifles, compared with the Glorious works of Christ and His Church. None of them all converted whole Nations to Christian Religion, none of them raised up the dead. None of them after death wrought any Miracles. See Tertullian writing of the Heathens. In *Apolog*: C. 22. 23. And *S. Austin* against the Donatists. *Homil.* 13. in *Ioan.* De *Utilit. Catech.* C. 16. As also *Lib.* 10. de *Cruit.* C. 16.

13. I say. 2. If the Miracles of Christ and the Apostles rationally proved against Iewes and Gentils, the *Credibility* of Apostolical Doctrin, The very like Signes and supernatural effects most evident in the Roman Catholick Church, as rationally prove against Sectaries the *Credibility* of our now professed Catholick Doctrin. I would say. Church Miracles constantly wrought in all Ages since Christianity began, are no less efficacious to draw Sectaries to the Belief of our Church Doctrin, than those the Apostles wrought were to induce Iewes and Gentils to the belief of Apostolical Doctrin. Here is one Proof. The same Signes and Marks of Truth when equal in Majesty, Worth, Quality, and Number ever discover to Reason the same Truth, For, God can no more deceive by such works of Grace than by his own Divine word. *Interrogemus ipsa Miracula* saith *S. Austin.* *Tract*: 14. in *Ioan*: *Quid nobis loquantur de Christo.* Let us ask of Miracles what they say of Christ? *Habent enim si intelligatur, linguam suam.* They want no tongue to speak with, their Language is plain for Christ. Iust so Say I and prove it; Church Miracles Speak as plainly for the Church. Wherefore if the Roman Catholick Church most clearly gives in evidence of Her Miracles equal in worth, quality, and number with those wrought by Christ and his Apostles, it followes, that as those first Apostolical wonders were sufficient to convince Iewes and Gentils of the Truth of Christianity, So these latter also wrought in the Church are of like force, and no less efficacious to

*The ancient  
and modern  
Miracles  
compared  
together.*



310 Disc. 2. C. 8. Of what weight Miracles are

What the  
Apostles did,  
the Church  
doth.

convince Sectaries of what ever Doctrine She teaches. Now ponder well what the Apostles did. They *cured the sick, disposed Devils, raised the Dead, converted Nations, &c.* But these very Miracles have been done in the Roman Catholick Church, yea and greater too, *Espe* we have the like Evidences of Truth in both the primitive Age and this, Consequently with it the same Truth. The Evidences hath been partly laid forth already, and shall be further proved presently. The Sequel is undeniable.

The like opposition  
made against  
Christ's  
Miracles  
and the  
Churches.

14. I say. 3. No otherwise, nor vpon any better ground can the Sectary Oppose the Miracles of our Church, than Iewes and Gentils haue opposed and yet doe oppose those of Christ and his Apostles. Obserue well. Will the Sectary Say our Miracles are wrought by the Devils power? So the Iewes Calumniated Christ own Glorious works. Will he Say, they are only fained by poor deluded or bold-lying Catholicks? So the Iewes speak of Christ's own Miracles to this day. Will he Say that some Miracles aouched true, haue been afterward evidently Counterfeit, and why may not those the Church glories in, be rancked with such? Contra. And why may not Christs own wonders be also listed with them? The Argument, if of any force equally concludes against both; For if the Forgery of some proue all forged, Christ's own Miracles no more escape the Censure; than if one should say, (t'is *S. Austins* instance) all women are naught, because some haue been so. Let then the Sectary show vpon good Principles That Church Miracles haue been forged, and he speak's to the purpose. In the interim, he may well think, his bold incredulous Humour makes none forged.

15. One may reply. There is a vast disparity between our Saviours Miracles registred in Scripture, and those we plead for, only attested vpon humane Faith. I Answer in order to Christians there is a Disparity in the *Testimony*, But that fall's from the purpose now. First because Christs Miracles were known and admitted vpon humane Authority, before Scripture was written

ten. 2. And chiefly, because both Iewes and Gentils as much slight our Scripture testifying those wonders, as the Miracles themselves, And make little account of either.

16. But when they read these things in Scripture, and moreover hear what Miracles God hath Constantly wrought in euery Age (yea almost euery year) in his Church, and yet continues that fauour to our present dayes; When they hear and read of the Miracles which that one sacred house of *Loreto* Euidences, the publick Monuments and Testimonies whereof are vndeniably Authentick, and able to conuince the most obdurate Gentile. When they read or hear of the continual Miracles done at the Reliques of S. James at *Compostella* in Spain the infinite number of Pelgrims resorting thither from all parts of Christendom (besides Records) bear witness of those great Benefits. When they read or hear of that perpetual Miracle seen in France, exhibited to all mens eyes in the Sacred Viall of *S. Mary Magdalen*, wherein the precious Blood gathered by that penitent Saint at our Sauours Passion is yet perserued, and Visibly boyl's vp on the very day he suffered after the reading of the Passion. A whole Nation testifies this, thousands and thousands haue seen it, and Spondanus. *ad An: 1147.* Saith, he beheld the viole in the Church of S. Maximin.

both Iewes  
and Hereticks con-  
uincid,

17. When again, they hear or read of the vndoubted Miraculous Cures wrought vpon the blind, the lame, and all sort of diseased Persons by the Intercession of our Blessed Lady at *Montaign*, (English vsually call the place *Sichem*) The euidence whereof is so vndeniable without dispute, that *Iustin Lipsius* in *his Apocalli* to the Reader, most iustly saith. They are not men (but rather beasts) or purposely shut their eyes, that see not those Miracles as clear as the Sun; For, saith He, many of them haue been manifest to our eyes and senses, And *Crispin Puteanus* speak's as fully the sense of his Predecessor. See his Praeface *ad Apocall.* *Hac ista Sec.* These very Miracles which the Mother of God began to work at *Montaign* this very Age we liue in, are so manifest, so many and most stupendous, that if any doubt of them, *Poterit*  
C & d

By what  
particular  
Miracles,  
they are  
Conuincid.

1312      Disc. 2. C. 8. *The glorious Miracle*

*Two certain  
Miracles  
related.*

*& de vniuersâ Numinis potentiâ dubitare*, He may as well doubt of all the power God hath, They are plain truths, rigorously and most severely examined, testified by Eye-witnesses, and now vpon Record &c. I am forced to omit innumerable latter Miracles, (The work would be Immense to recount but halfe) yet one most certain, and no less famous then certain, you haue here set down. Another truly wonderful, followes in the next Chapter. Sense, Experience Reason and all humane Faith goe to wrack, if either be bogg'd at. Those iudgements are peruerse, Those hearts harder then stones, that dare deny them Credit.

*The Admirable cure wrought by Blessed. S. Xaneries in the Famous City of Naples vpon a worthy Religious Person called F. Marcellus Mastrilli, a Noble man by birth, and by Profession of the Society of Iesus. The Proof hinted at above, reassumed.*

*Marcellus  
wounded.*

18. In the year 1634. The Vice-Roy of Naples Count Messey, pleased to keep à Magnificent Solemnity at his own Palace in Honour of the euer Blessed Mother of God. Amongst other Altars richly adorned to set forth the Festiual day, The care of one Altar was committed to F. Mastrilli, who standing on the lower steps of à ladder, and casually looking vp at one that took of Tapistrie nailed to à higher part of the wall, met with à sad Accident. Behold à Hammer of two pound weight fell directly, vpon the Temples of his head, struck him down, left him senseless, and grievously wounded. In this Peril, First taken vp by the hands of others, Hee was presently carried in à Couch to his own Colledge. Doctors of Physick and Surgeons without delay called for, searched the wound and found it Mortal. Forth with,

with, a burning feauer following vpon the hurt; so increased the danger in that noxious aire (a great enemy to wounds) and vnseasonable winter time, That all left hopeless, despaired of Marcellus Recouery. Besides his mouth by the Contusion of Nerues was so closed vp, that the poor Patient could take no sustenance. To help That, The Doctors (necessitated to vse violence) forced it open, and thrust an Instrument down towards his stomach, hoping thereby to clear the passage and fit it to receiue some nourishment. But with little good success, For the Cruel Remedy became an vnspcakable torment to the afflicted Patient. Soon after followed strong Conuulsion fits (plain Symtoms of death) and besides a Dead Palsie, which wholly took away the vse of his left arme.

*His wound  
increased  
Desperate  
and why.*

19. Whoener desires to see more of this desperate danger, And how neer Marcellus was at deaths doore, may please to read Daniel Bartoli in his second Part of Asia. lib. 5. at this Tittle *L'Imperio de Texangum*. Page with mee 441. and. 442. And also Michael de Elizalde. *Forma vera Religionis*. Quest: 37. N. 478. P. 339. who liued at Naples, and wrote this Miracle not long after it happened. In this condition Marcellus continued many dayes, despaired of by the very best and most expert Phisicians. Wherefore the Conclusion was to implore the mercy of God in his behalfe, to commend him as the manner is, to the prayers of the Community, and finally to administer Extrem vnction, For his obstructed Mouth and brest full of Clotted blood, hindered the taking the Holy Eucharist, or last Viaticum. The Doctors prudently aduiced to prepare him for death, For they found him now past all hope of Recouery, Nay, all of them with one Consent absolutely Concluded, Marcellus could not liue till the next morning.

*Death ex-  
pected.*

*The Doctors  
gave Mar-  
cellus ouer.*

20. Now here begins the Miracle. The 3.<sup>d</sup> of Ianuary four houres within night, The Fathers that watched with dying Marcellus, obserued Hedid not only moue and turn Himselfe to the wall, but heard him speak also; which seemed to them a wonder, For before Hee lay speechles not able to vtter a word, much

*The Miracle  
begins.*

Rr

less

less to moue his weak body. But what followes clear's all, The motion came from a stronger hand, And thus it was.

*With S.  
Xaverius  
/ Marcellus.*

21. S. Xaverius appeared in a pilgrims weed very Glorious to Marcellus, And with a Smiling Countenance demanded, whether He would rather dye at present, Or according to his former desire bee sent Missioner into the Indies? In passing please to know, the virtuous man euer languished after that Mission, Though hindred from it by Superiours, because of his tender and weak Constitution.

*Marcellus  
his vow.  
Reliques  
Applied to  
the wound.*

*S. Xaverius  
Comfortable  
words.*

22. Marcellus Answered I am ready to doe whatever God pleases; Yet according to my former purpose, may that be grateful to the Divine will, and granted by Superiours, I am in heart prepared to dye a Martyr for Christ amongst those Indians. Xaverius hereupon pronounced the form of a vow which the sick man (as the words were spoken by the Saint) repeated after Him. By this vow He obliged himselfe to renounce Country, Friends, and whatever is in the world to bee sent to the Indian Mission. You have the Form of the vow in *Bartoli* now cited. Page 444. In the next place a Relique of the Holy Cross and some others also which Marcellus had about his neck, were applied by the help of S. Xaverius to the wound in his head. Seill the Fathers present heard Marcellus speak for a long time together; some thought them words of a distracted brain, others iudged Otherwise. After these and many other Circumstances related by the Authors already quoted, Xaverius Spake to this Sense. *Marcellus be of good Courage, you are now perfectly cured. Your desire is granted, you shall goe to the Indies and there dye a Martyr.* This said the Saint disappeared.

*The Miracle  
most Evident.*

23. Without delay at all, Marcellus loock'd on as a dying man reuiued; instantly fate vp in his bed, called for his cloaths, Yea, saith Elizalde; *Exilis à letto seap't out of his bed,* And with a stronge Cheerful voice said. *I am well, I am perfectly Cured,* And so it was indeed. For the Mortal wound cause of His Malady quite Closed vp, appeared no more, And which is a wonder, the hair of his head cut of by the Chirurgeons to facilitate the cure,

care, was restored as formerly. So *Elizalde* testifies. n. 480. *Re-  
finit Capilli ad Veneris Curationem erasi.* His Paleness and weaknes,  
went away, Colour, strength and agility returned in that very  
Instant. What need I say More? *Marcellus* à Moment before  
at Deaths door, becomes found, healthful, and perfectly well.

24. Those who attended Him called together the Fathers of  
the house many in number, to bee Eye-witnesses of the wonder.  
All came with ioyful hearts, and First prostrate on the ground  
with much deuotion gaue immortal thanks to God for the cure,  
then Embraced *Marcellus* who took à little sustenance, which he  
had wanted for à long time. That done, the Superiour com-  
manded him forthwith to write down exactly euery particular hee  
had heard or seen that night, and to subscribe all with His own  
hand. Hee did so. The next morning, when whole Multitudes  
came to pray for *Marcellus* soul (the Humble man was indeed  
much beloved and honoured all *Naples* ouer) They found him  
perfectly reuonerd, saying Masse at S. *Xaverius* Altar. Pre-  
sently the Miracle manifest to all Eyes was soon diuulged through  
the whole City and held so indubitable, that some thought it  
needless to giue His Eminence the Lord Arch-bishop Informa-  
tion of it. Howeuer that was done and most exactly. The  
Doctors, the Surgeons, the Fathers, and other Eye-witnesses also  
of the wonder were asserbled before His Eminence, and All vpon  
Oath solemnly taken, aouched boldly without doubt without  
hesitancy the naked Verity, and ydeniable Truth of the Mira-  
cle. Now if any would bee further informed of the great Seue-  
rity vually held in the Sacred Congregation of *Rites* at *Rome*,  
when Miracles are brought to the Test before that high Tribunal,  
Though the whole world knowes the rigour, you may by the  
occasion giuen of this one wonder, read *Elizalde*. N. 485. This  
Short Relation permit's mee not to insist vpon So many large  
particulars. In lieu thereof, bee pleased to hear what F. *Eli-  
zalde* (one learned and à great Diuine) speak's of his owne  
knowledge. n. 481. Much to the sense, as followes.

Made  
known to the  
Community  
and say'd  
abroad.

Exam'd  
upon Oath.

25. I was saith Hee in *Spaine* when this great Miracle was wrought

R. 2

17



*A learned  
mans Testi-  
mony Con-  
cerning this  
Miracle,  
whilst he li-  
ued at Na-  
ples.*

by S. Xaverius, And although I am of an Humour incredulous enough not easily drawn to believe such Wonders, yet vpon the several Testimonies which came in great number from euery part of the World, I found my selfe euen then conuincied of the Truth. Now I haue liued at Naples well nigh three yeares, and Conuersed with many, who were in the Colledge at the time of this Wonderful cure, And with one particularly (a man vpright and iust) that was in the Chamber when Xaverius appeared to Marcellus. I haue attentiuely considered what euery one said, and after a diligent inquiry made, perceiue (as it euer falls out in a point of Truth) no difference amongst them, but Contrarywise, find all, vniu- labij. Speak the same, agreeing in one Relation. But let vs enue our own Witnesses. Italy, Spaine and the other parts of the Christian World neuer questioned the Miracle, but held it certain, and most prudently did so, For scarce any thing can be more Authentick remaining within the Limits of humane Faith. Vpon this certainty it was, that His Catholick Maiesty familiarly treated with Marcellus a long time together, desiring his prayers, and bountifullly offered all Assistance in order to his further voyage, so likewise did the Dukes and Princes of that Court. Nay, all sort of People came flocking to the pious Passenger, as if Hee had been one sent from Heauen, or raised from the dead. Happy were they that could speak with him, touch his garments, or receiue any little small trifle from His hands. Thus all reuerenced the Holy man. So great Renown the Miracle had gained euery where. Much to this sense Elizalde writes. Let vs now go on.

*Marcellus  
his Martyr  
dome, stran-  
ge, and  
Miraculous.*

26. Soon after the Miraculous cure, Marcellus began his long journey towards the Indies, and in the year 1638. arrived at Nangasque in Iapan, where taken prisoner, Hee first endured that usual and cruel Torment of water (known to euery one) but came out sound, not hurt at all. The standers by astonished at the Spectacle, presently commanded the Executioner to strick off his head. The Barbarous man attempted to doe it, but on a sudden made strengthles, wholly benumbed, was not able to moue his hand. Where vpon Marcellus said, *delay no longer, but in Gods name doo thy duty.* The fatal blow at those very words was giuen, And The Virtuous Marcellus became a Martyr and dyed for

the Christ, according to the Prophecy of S. Xaverius.

17. Now here I Ask what iust exceptions can Sectaries make against this Miracle, attested vpon Oath, rigidly examined, and vniuersally belieued? Will they say Marcellus was indeed wounded (for that many Seculars saw), yet the wound was but slight, not mortal and perhaps no more but a raising of the skin? Say so. The Doctors and Surgeons had been worse then beasts; to torture the poor Patient as they did by forcing down into His Stomack the Instrument already mentioned. Besides burning flames, Conuulsion Fits, Palsies (of themselves mortal) vually ensue not vpon slighter hurts. Will they say The Aparition of the Saint to Marcellus was either an Illusion, a dream at most, or a distemper of a dying mans fancy? That indeed might haue some colour, had wee not Euidence against it. For what can bee Answered to the strange effect, the Miraculous cure, I mean, which so suddainly followed in one short Moment of time? This (*clear Self-evidence*) speaks truth, and proves that God had a hand in the cure. None can Cauil at it, none can contradict it. Perhaps some will say. All was a fable, a cheat, and Fiction, The Fathers, Doctors, and Surgeons by compact fained one Mortally sick that was not, to gain lesuits the renown and Glory of a Miracle.

*No iust exceptions against the Miracle.*

*Canils answered.*

18. What's this? who are here accused and condemned? Give eare a little Gentle Reader. A flat Calumny will haue vs to belieue That All those venerable Fathers, those expert Doctors, Those experienced Surgeons, with others also who beheld the Miracle, All I say, Though they called God to witnesse by Solemn Oath taken vpon the sacred Gospel, That the cure was real and Miraculous were notwithstanding worse then very Villains, forsworn, base, abiect, and periured Persons. And this wee must Assent to, vpon no other proof, but because Malice likes well to Calumniate euer itching to decry Gods own Glorious wonders. Besides, wee must belieue those high Tribunals where the Miracle was most rigidly examined, and after examination vnanimously approued, to haue

*The just falsely accus'd.*

*Tribunals  
Condemned,*

been so notoriously vnjust, so impiously partial, and wickedly mislead, as to oblige Posterity to own vpon humane Faith, & Lie, an Imposture, In à word, that to be Gods Glorious work (à true Miracle) which really was not. Is it not impudency think ye to harbour such desperate Thoughts? The Diuel himselfe (though Father of lies) would be ashamed to calumniate so boldly, without some Colour or apparence of proof. Yet here we haue not any.

*The Calumny  
relied.  
The Miracle  
proued true.*

29. Now I'll proue the Sectaries Assertion to bee à flat Calumny, and withall further euince the truth of the Miracle, S. Xauerius, as wee haue heard, ascertain'd Marcellus of his cure, and likewise *Prophecyed*, that Hee should goe to the Indies and there dye à Martyr for Christ. I know Malice may Cavil here, And deny all. But Mark what followes. Vpon the Assurance of this Prediction Marcellus Himselfe, the Reuerend Fathers also and others relyed, when they so Confidently gaue out, That hee should lose his life at Iapan, and dye à Martyr. Resecti beseech you. Had it not been in the highest measure impudent, nay more than à foolish Presumption of those Fathers, to haue filled all mens eares with that *Prophetical Speech*, vpon meer future vncertainties? The performance whereof, (all know well) was liable to à thousand Disasters and Casualities, in that *immense voyage from Europe to the furthest parts of the World*. Speak impartially. How easily Might Marcellus (none of the strongest Constitutions) haue dyed in the way? What if Pirates had seized on the Ship, and cast him ouer board? What if the Vessel had perished by Tempest with the virtuous Man, and other Passengers? How much scorned would the Fathers haue been, who certainly were neuer so strangely besotted as to expose themselves and the reputation of their Order to à publick contempt vpon meer Contingencies and weak Coniectures. Hence I infer, They had by virtue of S. Xauerius Prophecy à high Moral Assurance of the euent, The Prophecy spoken some years before Marcellus his Martyrdom, was true, And the real Effect of his death proued it true, neither Diuel nor

Moral

Mortal man could certainly foresee Things so remote, and yet to come. God therefore was the Author of that Prediction, And consequently His Diuine power by the means of the Saint, wrought the Miracle.

*God wrought  
the Miracle.*

30. Its high time now to reassume what I began with, and said above. When Iewes and Gentils read our scriptures which with them may well deserue as much credit as Humane faith giues to Casars Commentaries or any other History; When they find in that Sacred book how strangely Christianity was first established, and introduced by the virtue of our Saviours glorious Wonders. When they fall lower and see (though still vpon Humane Faith) an euident Continuance of the very like Miracles wrought in the Roman Catholick Church through euery Age. The Conuiction is by good law so strong, the Proofs for vndeniable Miracles so manifest to the dullest Gentle, that He may as well deny (as Lipsius Saith) the Sun to shine as doubt of those most glorious visible wonders vnquestionable, in this one Society of Christians. And this hold's true, Although no more but Humane faith resting on most Certain Authority inform's vs of these Miracles, For such a Faith, as great Diuines Obserue, often comes to so clear a degree of Certitude, that you may well call it an *undubitable kind of Euiden-*  
*ti.* How certainly do we hold (it is S. Austins Instance. lib. 6. *Confess. C. 3.*) that we are born of such and such Parents? How certainly do we belieue and vpon humane Authority, Saith Suares, *Tom. 1. de Incarn: Disp. 31. Sect. 2.* That Titus and Vespasianus destroyed Hierusalem? And can any Cordial man Question, if He lay prejudice aside, but that true and most glorious Miracles haue been as certainly wrought in the Church, as that those two Emperours destroyed Hierusalem, or that such are our Parents? I appeal to euery ones Conscience for Answer.

*The Proofs  
hinted at  
above, urged*

*The weight  
of humane  
Faith.*

31. By all now said vve see first, that what euer can be proposed against our Churches Miracles, hath like force against Christ's own glorious works. And I challenge Protestants to  
 hint

*Sectaries  
justly repre-  
hensible,  
And why.*

hint but at one Argument which doth not equally strike at both. We see. 2. How Hideous à Sin Sectaries commit, who Scornfully slight all those known and most evident Miracles wrought among Christians, since the Apostles times: By this their vnworthy Procedure, they rob Christ's Spouse of Her greatest Glory, falsify His own sacred words, Propheying of greater wonders than he did, And finally make the Conversion of Iewes and Heathens to Christianity impossible. For, giue me à naked Church vvithout Signes, without Marks, without Motiues inducing to truth ( and the most conuincing Signe of all, 'is the Glory of Miracles ) Nothing remain's propofable to à poor Infidel that's meet to conuince his Reason, But the bare letter of Scripture, or the essential Doctrin of the Church, vvhich solely considered more affrights weak Reason, ( naturally auerse from high Mysteries ) than brings it to any Submission or Acquiescency. I say therefore the sin of Sectaries is grievous, Whilst Miracles are slighted, by doing so, they slight the Church, yea Christ himself, and hasten apace to Atheism.

## CHAP. IX.

*A word to a few Objections, as also to Mr sitting-  
fleets unworthy Exceptions against that  
evident Miracle wrought at  
Zaragoza in Spain.*

1. **T**He objections are as few as fallacious, and cannot be otherwise, when, as it is said, All of them prove as much (that's just nothing) against our Saviours own Miracles as against those of the Roman Catholick Church. To see this truth manifested and difficulties vanish into nothing, be pleased to afford a little Attention.

1. The Sectary may Obiect first. None of vs all know what strange effects nature can produce in certain circumstances, nor what Power the Diuel has to work Miracles; wherefore Scripture forwarn's vs. 1. *Thess. 2.* Of Antichrists great Prodigies, as also of False-Christe and false-Prophets appearing with Signes and wonders. *Matth. 24.* We may justly suspect, if nature alone cannot doe such works, that the Diuel had a hand in most of our Church Miracles. Contra. 1. And You see first, the Argument Equally oppugn's Christs own Miracles, li- cence both Jewes and Gentils to slight him as a false-Prophet, and his glorious wonders also. Contra. 2. Not one of these False-Prophets once raised the dead to life, nor after their own death did any thing like a Miracule, as the departed Saints of Gods Church haue done most frequently by a touch of their Reliques only, which Truth of (mighty right) deserues Refle- xion, and refutes what euer Donatist, or Coniurer can say in behalf of counterfeit Miracles. Contra. 3. And obserue well

*One obie-  
tion.*

*Found weak  
and frivo-  
lous.*



*Church  
Miracles  
above the  
power of  
Diuels,*

the Obiection. *None knowes what nature or the Diuel can doe.* What then I beseech you? May one infer from our knowing the Diuels power that this euil Spirit hath actually wrought all the Miracles recorded in Scripture, and Ecclesiastical History? To Assert this we must not only know how farr his power reaches, but more haue Assurance also Of his actually doing such Wonders. And thus much (manifestly improbable) neither is nor can be ascertained vpon the weakest Principle within the compass of nature or grace. We vsually say, the Diuel appears with a Clouen foot, That is, you may easily discern his Villainy, And we know he neuer casts out euil Spirits like Himself from possessed Persons, which yet hath been done and frequently in Gods Church. He can, it is true, if we belieue History take vp the Deuinded Parts of a dead man and act with them for a while, But there is no such Motion, no such Operations in the dead assumed Corps, as haue been seen in many Miraculously restored to life. Be it how you will, We are sure God can doe, yea and hath done great Miracles, when therefore all imaginable Circumstances forceably induce vs to belieue that they are his own glorious works, it is I hope more wisdom to Ascribe them to an Omnipotent Power, than to Father them vpon Diuels.

3. Some who plainly see, its a degree of madness to doubt of so much humane faith as Testifies of Miracles wrought in the Roman Catholick Church grant many haue been done, But then Obiect. 2. God did them to manifest that Christ is the true Messias, or to work a Belief in vs of so much Doctrin only as is Common to all Christians, but not to confirm our Popish Errours, of *Praying to Saints*, *Purgatory* &c. Contra. This Argument also impugn's our Sauours great Miracles, which were not wrought (one may say) to confirm all the Doctrin he taught, but a Part or parcel of it only. Contra. 2. If Miracles Mark out a Doctrin common to all, or confirm so much truth And no more; It seem's strange, that Arians, Pelagians and Protestants work not Miracles as frequently as the Church doth, For these men own a Doctrin common to all Christians,

yet

yet show none of these wonders. Contra. 3. There is not one Doctrine taught by our Church, (and held erroneous by Sectaries) which is not *Sealed, Signed, and Attested* by evident Miracles. We have innumerable for Christs Real and substantial Presence in the Eucharist; As many for the Inuocation of Saints, as also for the Honour due to holy Reliques. Innumerable proue that third place of Purgatory &c. All these (may good Authors deserue Credit) are vpon vndoubted Record. And what iust Exception haue Sectaries against so great Authority? I'll tell you. Their own incredulous Humour. Here is all. Whereas, could they speak to the cause, they should giue vs weight for weight, and Oppose what we Allege (in behalf of Miracles) vpon grounded Principles. That is, they Should euince positiuely that our Authors are meer Cheats, and fain Stories, when we read of Miracles wrought in confirmation of praying to Saints, the Real Presence. And this in all law of Disputation they are obliged to do vpon solid Proofs indeed, distinct from their own Incredulity, or a meer Saying, *Such Records are false.* But do what ye will Sectaries can neuer be driuen to dispute vpon Principles.

*Miracles  
truly alleged  
for every  
Doctrin: the  
Church  
teaches.*

4. A third Obiection. *S. Austin. Lib. de Vnit: Ecclesia.* Saith. *We therefore say not, We believe because so many Wonders are done all the world ouer in holy places, for what euer we find in this kind. Ideo sane approbanda quia in Ecclesia Catholica sunt,* are to be approued because they are wrought in the Catholick Church. Hitherto, the obiection is of no force, For the Saint only Saies, No new Miracles ought to gain certain credit, But such only as are wrought in the Church, or such as confirm Her Doctrine, or finally haue the Churches Approbation. Now because he disputes against the Donatists, and supposeth the Church known vpon other grounds expressed in Scripture, *Her Vnity Chiefly and vniversal extent ouer the World,* before these latter Miracles were heard of. Let us, Saith *S. Austin*, waue this Plea of Miracles (you Donatists allege yours, and I mine) and Argue by Scripture only, and see what Church Scripture commend's antecedently known;

*S. Austin  
alleged  
against Mi-  
racles  
Speaks no  
thing for  
Sectaries.*

SS 2

before

How the  
Saints plead-  
ed against  
the Dona-  
tists.

before these latter Miracles came to our knowledge. Which is to say, though the after Particular Miracles added to others formerly done, may much strengthen our Faith, yet absolutely Speaking, Faith depend's not of them, Because the Church we believe in is sufficiently manifested by Her Unity, Perpetuity, and Unchangeableness expressed in Scripture. *Hæc sunt causa nostra documenta, hæc firmamenta.* Here in lies all we have to say, Whilst we contest with you Donatists that own Scripture with vs, yet Cautil at our Miracles. Who ever read's this one Chapter exactly And draws any other sense from the whole Context than what is now briefly hinted at, will much oblige me. may he please to discover it.

5. One yet may Obiect. *S. Austin* Saith more, and it seem's much against vs. *Non ideo ipsa manifestatur Catholica quia hæc in se sunt.* The Catholick Church is not vpon that Account manifested to you Donatists, because these Miracles are wrought in it. I Answer. 1. The words vnderstood as Sectaries interpret Euert as wholly the Miracles of our Saviour, who said. *If you will not believe me, believe my Works.* 2. The Sectaries sense impugn's also the express Doctrin of *S. Austin. de Viliis. Credendi. C. 27.* Where He Asserts that Hereticks are condemned by the Maiesty of Miracles. Besides, Their sense is nothing to the purpose, because in this very Passage He speak's of latter Miracles known to *S. Ambrose* or *Millan*, And Saith, Hee will no more insist on These, than permit the Donatists to talk of their False-visions; For the Church is sufficiently manifested without them vpon à Surer Principle (the Holy Scripture) which the Donatists admitted, and therefore whilst They pretended to Miracles as well as *S. Austin* did, Hee prudently waied that Discours, and Argued by Scripture only, leaving Miracles to their own worth and weight. I say to their own weight, which is gathered from this great Doctors Discourse.

Why Hee  
waied the  
proofs of Mi-  
racles with  
the Dona-  
tists.

6. Our Lord Iesus, saith he, arose from the dead, and manifested himself to his Disciples and offered his sacred body to be touched by their hands, yet, lest that might be thought à fallacy, he indged it meet to confirm

his Resurrection more Principally by the Testimony of the Law, the Prophets and Psalms, shewing all things were now accomplished in him. Whence I infer, as the touching his Sacred body was Proof enough, though not the chiefest of his Resurrection, when Scripture was at hand to make that most manifest; So Miracles also wrought in the Church manifest that Oracle but not Principally to the Donatists, who ought to haue believed more firmly the Churches Doctrin vpon that one potent Proof of the Apostle.

*The true Reason, given.*

1. Tim: 3. 15. *The Pillar and ground of Truth*, than for all the later wonders done in the Church. Yet these haue à mighty force and are stronge Inducements, so far as Motiues can reach; but not the chief and Principal cause of any mans Belief, or Assent. Read then S. Austins words thus. The Church is not made manifest by her latter Miracles to à Donatist who Cauils at such wonders, but Principally by Scripture which he admit's, and will like Protestants be tryed by, You haue the Saints full Sense and à great Truth with it, whereof there can be no doubt at all, when. *Lib. Contra Epist: Fundamenti. C. 4. 5.* He Demonstrat's the Church by Her Miracles.

7. To end this point between S. Austin and the Donatist; as also between Catholicks and Protestants, I say all Controuersies are fully tried and happily ended by Scripture only. But how? Not because any can pretend to find every Tenet of Faith clearly set down in so many express Terms of holy Writ, For the Protestant pretend's not to so much in behalf of his Doctrin, But thus the Orthodox discourfes with S. Austin. *Scripture evidently points at the Church of IESVS Christ known by Her Marks and manifest Signes, by Her Antiquity, Her large Spread over the whole World, by the Succession of Her Pastors and Doctors, Miracles, and the like Signal Motiues.* Thus much once clearly laid forth in the written Word, that Holy Book remit's him to the Church Clearly marked, commend's Her, saith S. Austin, and command's him to hear and learn what euer She teaches.

*How Scripture decides all Controuersies.*

8. Whence it is, that our profound Doctor Disputing the Case; whether the Baptized by Hereticks were to be rebaptized,

zed, laboured not to decide the Question by any expresse words in holy Scripture (wholly silent in this particular) But contrarywise teaches, that the Church which is diffused all ouer (and no Party of Donatists shut vp in à corner of Afrique) was to give Sentence herein, For She is that great Oracle, which Scripture commend's. Read *Lib. 2. de Bapt. C. 4. And de Vnir: Escles. C. 22.* Thus briefly you see the true difference between the Protestant and Catholick, The first has not à word of Scripture for his Tenets, much less any Orthodox euident Church. The Catholick relies on à Church spread the whole world ouer, known by Miracles, Conuerfions &c. And Scripture command's him firmly to belieue what euer She Proposes as Faith. *Qui vos audit me audit.* Whoer hears the Church hears Christ, And in this Sense Scripture manifesting Gods own Oracle, which cannot but propole truth, end's all Controuersies.

The Catho-  
licks strong-  
hold.

A fourth  
Obiection  
solued.

9. A 4.<sup>th</sup> Obiection. Iulian the Apostata as S. Gregory Nazian. *Orat. 1. in Iulian:* And Theoder: *Lib: 3. Histo. C. 3.* arreth, droue away Diuels with the Sign of the Cross, Therefore wicked men can doe Miracles, And why may not Almighty God for Reasons best known to his infinite wisdom do strange wonders, and permit an Arian to Say, All are wrought to Confirm his false Doctrin. Contra. Both Parts of the Obiection equally impugn the Primitiue Miracles of Christ and the Apostles. To the first I answer. An Heretick may work à Miracle to prove Catholick Doctrin, but neuer to make his own False Opinion probable. The Reason is. God who is Truth and Goodnes it self, can no more deceiue by his *own VVorks*, than by his *own VVords*. *Sicut humana consuetudo saith S. Austin. Epist: 49. vobis Divina potentia, etiam factū loquitur.* As man speak's by words, so God speak's by his works. But the Works or Wonders now Spoken of because supernatural proceed from God, And as is supposed deceiue, Therefore it ill beseem's an Infinit Truth and Goodnes to do them. Vpon this Ground I say likewise, Diuine Providence will neuer permit his own glorious Works (*Seals and Signes of Truth*) to be abused by wicked men. But

God can no  
more deceiue  
by his *own*  
Works then  
by *his* Words.

of this particular I intend to speak more largely hereafter.

10. Wee now Come to Mr. Stillingfleets Canils you haue some of them. Part. 1. C. 5. p. 154. And 135. Where he doth not so much, impugne Miracles as would haue them done by such Persons as he likes well of; Popes for example, that pretend to infallibility. And if (which is easy) we produce many wrought by Holy Popes, His next Querie perhaps may be. Why all of them are not Miraculous mien alike? In à word I like not to search into the depth of Gods secret Counsel, And therefore briefly discourse of persons fauoured with such Graces, as S. Austin doth of different Places. Tom. 2. Epist. 137 to his Clergy and people at Hippo, where he proposeth this Question. *Quare in alijs locis hac miracula fiant & non in alijs*: Why are Miracles done in some places and not in others? *VVe haue known some wrought at Milan: In Africa though full of Saints Bodies, not so?* He return's this wise Answer grounded on the Apostles words. 1. Cor. 12. *Non omnes Sancti &c.* All saints haue not the Gift of curing diseases, all *discern not spirits, ita nec in omnibus memorijs Sanctorum. &c.* So God who diuides his Graces according to his own best will, doth not these wonders at the Memory of euery Saint. And who dare enter into his secret Counsel, or ask why he doth so? Why raised he three dead men by S. Dominick, and not one we know of by S. Austin? *Diuidit propria unicuique prout vult*, He is Lord and distributes his own fauours as he pleaseth. And thus we Answer Mr. Stillingfleet who next Saith some thing of Miracles done in Corners. What can the man mean? Are all the wonders wrought at *Loreto Compostella, Sicchem* and other places seen to innumerable, and All vpon certain record to be callid *Corner Miracles*? Be pleased to hear worse yet.

11. Page 135. Think not saith Mr. Stillingfleet *VVe are of such stuff saith, that the pretended growing out of à leg in Spain, or any of your famous Miracles wrought by your Priests in Italie will persvade vs to believe your Church infallible.* Again, after his Talk of Diuels doing no feats when Opposers are by, He utters this scornful language. *It is an easy thing for à Stump to grow à leg in its passage from Spain*

Mr Stilling-  
fleets Canils  
answered.

And first  
why God  
works Mira-  
cles by some,  
and not  
by others.

Mr Stilling-  
fleets vnjust  
exceptions  
against the



Miracle  
wrought at  
Zaragoza.

*Spain hisber, For fama crescit eundo.* And in despite of Truth, call'd out too much bitter venom to obscure à Glorious work of God, wrought by the Intercession of our Blessed Lady vpon à young man at Cæsar Augusta or Zaragoza in Spain (where you haue her miraculous Statua Set on à Marble Pillar And for that reason is called, *Nuestra Sennora del Pilar*) It is one of the most euident and clearest Miracles vvhich I belieue hath been done in the memory of any man now liuing. I haue the whole Printed Relation by me both Latin and Dutch, vvritten by *Petrus Nodius* Doctor of Physick, and dedicated to his Excellence Don Francisco Marquis of Caretto and Grana, Embassador Extraordinary from the Emperour to His Catholick Maiesty. The Substance whereof is thus.

12. *Ego ab Casar Augusta Venio &c.* I come from Zaragoza ad bring tydings of à Miracle not heard of in any age. A young man had his leg cut of and buried, which was Miraculously restored again, in the Intercession of the most Sacred virgin. My Lord, I here present you With à Gift it is not mine, but our Blessed Ladies, to whom immortall thanks are due for the fauour. Given at Madrid *ibid.* Mart. Anno 1642. I haue besides the Licence of the Vicar General, Don Gabriel de Aldama appointing the whole Narration to be Printed, which begins. *Nos el Licenciado Consultor del Seno de ficio &c.* Subscribed.

Lic. D. Gabriel de Aldama.

And vnderwritten. *Por su mandado*

*Martin de Lual Ntario,*

Testimonies  
of that Stupendious  
Miracle,

13. Yet more. I haue the Attestation of Hieronimus Brizids, who had order from the Vicar General to peruse and censure the vvhole Relation presented to the said Vicar, Don Gabriel de Aldama. *Legi* (saith he) *libellum de stupendo miraculo suo saculo inaudito Dni Virginis de Pilari, quod verum esse scio. Quia* I haue read the little book, concerning that Stupendious and strange

to be in this our Age of our Blessed Lady of Pilari, which I know to be true, I knew the youth at Casaraugusta, or Zaragoza, when he had but one leg; and there begged Almes at the Church door, I saw him afterwards at Madrid, whither he came at the command of his Catholick Majesty, and saw him going on both legs. I saw the Mark, which the Blessed Virgin had left, where the leg was cut off, And not only I, but all the Fathers of the Imperial Colledge beheld this (I might add upon certain Relation innumerable other Eye-witnesses and of noble Men too, then in the court of Spain) I knew the young man's Parents, I knew the Chirurgeon that cut off the leg. Given at Madrid. 12. Mart. 1642. Underwritten.

### Hieronimus Brizids.

14. We may add hereunto the Approbation of F. Ioseph Crespo, Prior of S. Martins Monastery in Madrid, who knew, as he saith, this Miracle to be most true, and witnessed it vnder his own hand. 4. Martij. 1642. Lastly. Facultas Regia, or his Catholick Majesties Licence, is thus annexed. Signata à D. Augustino de Araya & Cannizares, Scriba Camera Regia. You shall see presently how rigidly the Miracle was examined, and afterward approved by the Lord Arch-Bishop of Zaragoza. The particulars whereof are briefly as follow.

The licence  
of His Catholick  
Majesty.

15. This young man called Michael Ioannes Pellicer about nineteen years of age, was born at Calanda à Village in Aragon, Son to Michael Pellicer à Husbandman, and Mary Blasco, Inhabitants of that Village. Whilst he served his Vncle Iames Blasco, being in à Cart loaden with wheat, by chance fell down, and one of the wheels ran ouer his right leg, and broke it. His Vnde and Friends being poor Conueyed him first to the Hospital at Valentia, where remedies were applied, but without success. Thence brought to the great Hospital at Zaragoza, Hee was Committed to the care of Iohn de Eñanga à most expert Surgeon and publick Professor of Physick, who finding the leg wholly rotten cut it off four fingers below the knee, and buried

Who this  
young man  
was?

His right  
leg broken.

He was  
Carried to  
the great  
Hospital at  
Zaragoza.

His leg cut  
off.

T

ried

ried it. When the wound was some what healed; the same man went on Crutches to our Ladies Church, and there both begged Almes, and earnestly implored the Blessed Virgins fauorable Assistance. He was well known to all there for the space of two whole years. In the year of our Lord 1640. He went back to his Parents at Calenda, and going vp and down as well as he could begged sustenance for Himself, and poor Parents.

16. On the 19. day of March. Anno 1640. well wearied with gathering vp Hay sitting with his Father, Mocher, and two others, he laid aside his crutch and went to bed. About à 11. of the Clock that night, his Mother entring the chamber where he was, found one in the bed with two feet, and suspecting him to be some souldier ( for then à whole troop lodged in the Village) presently ran to her Husband who came in, knew his son well, wakened him out of sleep.

*Was Miraculously restored.*

17. On à sudden the yet not too well awaked youth, brake forth into these words. *I dreamed I Was in our Ladies Chappell of Pileri, and annointed my leg With the oyle of the Lamp burning there.* The poor Father ouerjoyed replied Render, my Child, immortal thanks to God, our Blessed Lady hath restored thee thy leg. Hitherto, the youth before his Father spake reflected not on the Miracle. All this noysed abroad, drew in many Eye-witnesses that night, and the next day more, who accompanied the young man to the Church, where, to the end all might behold the Miracle, His foot, which yet stood much wrested to one side, came before à Multitude of people to its ovvn natural Posture, and those who saw him the day before wanting one leg, obserued him now walking strongly on two, found and whole.

*The Miracle divulged.*

18. Thus much noted by à publick Scribe and spread abroad, soon after called the youth to Cæsaraugusta, Where he had his Iudges assembled, witnesses examined, Lawyers pleading and the whole cause most rigidly discussed. All which performed, The most Illustrious Lord Arch-Bishop of Zaragosa, D. Petrus Apolaza, publickly gaue Sentence the 27. day of April. Anno 1642. that the restoring of that leg was à Work about the force of nature,

*Was rigidly examined.*

*The sentence finally given*

nature, and therefore might without doubt be deservedly esteemed, *a prodigium Miraculi*. Those who attested the same, after due examination, and subscribed their names were as follow.

19. Don Antonio Xauirre Prior of S. Christina. D. Ioannes Perat official of the Metropolitan Church at Zaragoca. Don Vito de Vera Archdeacon there. Don Ioan Plano à Frago also Official. D. Philip Bardaxi Interpreter of the sacred Canons. D. Didacus Chueca Canon of Caesar augusta. D. Martinus Irribarne Canon and Reader there. F. Bartholomeus Foyas Prouincial of S. Francis order. F. Antonius Ortin Prouincial of the Minims of S. Francis de Paula. D. Dominicus Cebrian, the first Reader of Diuinity at Zaragosa. The sentence giuen, was published and declared by great Doctors of the Canon and Civil law, D. Aegidius Fuster; and Michael Cypres à publick Notary also. It was signed by D. Antonius Albert Zaporta the Apostolical Notary, and chief scribe of the Ecclesiastical Court at Caesar Augusta. D. Thomas Tamayo de Vargas the Kings Historiographer of Spain and the Indies has published it in his Annals extant in the Spanish language, Printed at Alcalá.

*Subscribed  
by many.*

*Published.*

*And now  
extant in the  
Spanish  
Annals.*

20. The Relation ends thus. *Videant haeretici an hoc tam facile &c.* Let Hereticks look well to it, whether they can as easily fight this, and other strange Miracles done in our time among the Indians, as they scorn the restoring of S. Iohn Damascens hand at the Intercession of our Blessed Lady. This we now speak of, is Testified by Eyewitnesses. Both Spaniards and French were Spectators. The vvhole cause lasted long vnder à most seuerè Examination, and finally to make the Glorious vvorks of God known, Sentence vvvas Iuridically pronounced by à vvorthy Arch-Bishop as is now said. *Quod si rei tam nota contradiere auint.* And if Sectaries yet dare contradict so manifest à Verity. *Quia illos &c.* Who is there that vvill not look on them. As impudent, and list them among incredulous Iewes?

*The end of  
the Relation*

21. Yet our Mr Stillingfleet, forsooth, Shifts all off with à leet. It is an easy thing for à Stump to grovv à leg, in its passage from Spain hither. What will not this man write to his petty

T t 2

purpose

*Mr Stilling-  
fleet cheats,  
and opens  
fraud.*

*What's re-  
quired of  
Him?*

purpose ift come in his way? What will he not part away and add to à Story remote from the knowledge of the vulgar (His book is full of such fraud) Will he not think ye, say any thing before the illiterate and ignorant, in the high Mysteries of Faith, whilst he blushes not to cheat and deceive his Reader in à matter of Fact Notoriously known to the world? If he thinks I have forged this Relation, Hee shall have the very individual Copy I made use of sent him, the Bulk is not big. If he doubts of the Authority of these witnesses already produced, and say yet all is à Fourb, I'll say as easily, I am fooled in believing there is such à man in the world as Mr Stillingfleet whom I never saw, And next will force him to exchange Principles with me à little. You Sir say its à fourb, à pretended, no real Cure. I say Contrary, The Cure was real and à great Miracle. Prove now you Your Assertion vpon as good Humane Authority as I have proved mine And we come to Principles, fir to decide in the present Matter. Fail to do this, your Assertion hath not so much as one leg to stand on, besides fancy, or something worse.

## CHAP. X.

*Other Marks and Signes, peculiar to the Roman Catholick Church proue her Orthodox, And make Her Doctrine evidently credible. These laid forth to Sense and Reason, distinguish the true Church from all Erring Societies Inferences drawn from the Doctrin Here deliuered.*

1. **V**ery little may suffice, concerning the first part of the Title, our Catholick Authors hauing done the work to my hands whilst they treat most largely and learnedly, of the Amplitude, and Vniuersallity, of the Roman Catholick Church, of the continued and Succession of Her Bishops, Pastors, and people, of Her Vnity in one and the same Faith, of Her Sanctity, of the efficacy of Her Doctrin in conuerting whole Nations to Christ, which S. Austin justly hold's miraculous. The Largeness of this great moral Body ( rightly called by Sectaries à growing Religion which no persecution of Tyrants could hitherto suppress) For time, extends it self without dispute to all pass'd Ages since Christ, And if we speak of place, the growth successively, was so great, That, *In omnem terram exiuit sonus eorum*, it hath been preach'd with immense fruit to all Nations, Answerable to that of the Royal Prophet. *Psal. 2.* where the eternal Father speaking to Christ our Lord, *as man*, giues him an ample Kingdome, spread all ouer for his Possession. *Ask of me and I will giue the Gentils for thy Inheritance, and thy Possession, the last ends of the earth,*

*The Largeness of the Catholicks Church.*

2. Hence we first distinguish the Church of Christ from the lewish Synagoue, limited to one time, (till the coming of our true



Distingui-  
shes Her  
from all false  
sects.

The Ampti-  
tude of  
Christ's  
Kingdoms,

Professancy  
increases  
not. And  
why.

Messias) And to one place also, For the Sacrifice essential to the Religion, could not be offered but in the Temple of Hierusalem only. We distinguish both Church, and Doctrin likewise from *Mahumatis*, *Nestorianism*, *Eutychianism*, and other Heresies in the East, which never got any considerable footing in these Western parts of Europe. Finally we distinguish it from *Lutheranism*, *Catharianism*, and *Protestantism*, a confused Mixture of both: and other late Doctrins. These and their dissenting Heads stay in our Northern Climats, without fruit or Progress made into *Asia*, *Africa*, *Greece*, or the like remote Countries, wherefore some doubt not to auerr, and most truly; That the Holy Orders of S. Dominick, of S. Francis, and of the Society of Jesus are further spread, more diffused through the world at this day, than all the Sects or Subdivisions of Protestants ever yet were, or I think will be. But the Kingdome of Christ's Church, as Tertullian Cited above. Chap. 1. n. 6. well obserues, *Vbique regnat*, reignes euery where, and is euery where believed, Nor can these latter Sectaries now in an aged world, hope to Propagate further; For if S. Austin. *De Viu. Ecclie*. C. 14. Thought it enormously improbable, that Domitian then so early, could diffuse it selfe the whole world ouer, much less can our confined Protestants very late Teachers after so many Centuries, when Heresy euery where lyes à gasping, Hope to draw forreign Nations to à Belief of their Nouelties.

3. The reason *à Priori* is. A greater extent, à further increase seem's inconsistent with the very Nature of those who profess the Religion, For once sitting in the *Vine*, and drawing Nutriment from thence, they wilfully cut them selves off, and separated from the Church, Therefore as S. Austin saith they lie where they are, *Whining*, and *dying*, without Lustre, or any Enlargement. Again; as they began this new learning without Commission to teach, so they can send none hereafter Authoritatively, to spread it further. Hence I Argue, That Church only is Christ's true Spouse which was from the first Rise of Christianity, and successively got Possession in the four Parts of the world, But thus the Roman Catholick Church was, and is Still diffused (here is Christ's promised Inheritance)

Therefore She is the only true Church. Contrarywise, the narrow, confined, and iarring multitudes of Sectaries scattered up and down in à few corners in Europe, All late Beginners, and shameful Desertors of this Ancient Society, neuer had so ample an inheritance, and Consequently Their pretence of being the true Church of Christ is more than improbable.

4. VVe may yet subioyn to the Amplitude of our Religion the ever visible and neuer interrupted Succession of Bishops, and Pastors, in the Rôman Catholick Church from Christs time. A Mark no less euident to sense, than openly destructive of Heresy. This succession long since Prophesied by Daniel. *Cap. 2.* *Christ Kingdom shall neuer be dissipated*, and foretold by the Apostle *1 Thes. 4. 11.* *He gave some Apostles &c.* Sett's forth the Glory of it. VVe need not in this place, to weary the Reader with the known Authority of S. Austin positively Asserting. *Contra Epist. fundam.*

C. 4. That the Succession of Pastors from S. Peters time, held him in the Catholick Church and the Argument is more fully urged again. *Lib. de utilit. Credendi C. 17.* VVee need not tell any with S. Cyprian. *Epist. 76.* That, that man is not in the Church, nor can be thought à Bishop who succeeds to none, but hath his Authority and Origin from himself. These and other forceable Testimonies we waue, and urge Sectaries, as the ancient Tertullian did the Hereticks of his time; *Lib. de praesc. Eualant ordinem Episcoporum suorum &c.* Let them vnfold the Catalogue of their Bishopr from this day to Luther, and from Luther upward, and here we call not for *Hussites*, *Waldenses* or such like men, but for à continued descent of Bishops, and Pastors, Lawfully ordained, and commissioned by Authority to preach Protestantcy, VVe call indeed but hear of none, before the daies of that unfortunate Luther. Therefore as I said above, they are sons without Fathers, they would be thought spiritual Children, but are so rebegotten that no body owns them.

5. Reflect à little, Gentle Reader, and cease not to wonder at the greatest Paradox, I think, that euer entred into the thought of man. Holy Scripture Ascertaines vs, that Prouident

The succession of Lawful Pastors, urged.

Protestants have none.

6. Reflect à little, Gentle Reader, and cease not to wonder at the greatest Paradox, I think, that euer entred into the thought of man. Holy Scripture Ascertaines vs, that Prouident

7. Reflect à little, Gentle Reader, and cease not to wonder at the greatest Paradox, I think, that euer entred into the thought of man. Holy Scripture Ascertaines vs, that Prouident

*A Paradox  
maintained  
by Seditaries.*

ee hath appointed Bishops to gouern his Church, Pastors and Doctors to teach till the Consummation of Saints, for the edifying of Christs Mystical body. The Roman Catholick Church giues in Her Catalogue of Bishops, and Pastors, euer since Christ. The first Apostolical Pastors receiued their learning from an Infallible Master, God and man, These conueyed it to their Successors, They to others, till this very age, And to proue that They both kept and faithfully conueyed the same Doctrin without Change or Alteration, you haue not only Church Authority, the greatest on earth, but more Gods own seal set to this Doctrin, Christs owne signes and Marks, *Miracles, vnderstanding Miracles, Conversions of nations &c.* Now start vp a knot of late vnkknown strangers called Protestants, without Bishops, without Pastors, for 15. Ages, These pretend to haue receiued new letters, new learning from Iesus Christ, That is an other sense of Scripture, than was formerly deliuered, This Letter is read, This learning is published to the world. VVe Ask what lawful Pastors taught it four Centuries since? VVhat ancient Church owned it? They Answer none. VVe demand again, To haue at least a sight of Gods Seal set to this Letter, some visible Marks of Christ, Miracles for example, to make the doctrin accepted. They haue not any. Ergo say wee *The letter is forged, the Doctrin is false, uneuident, improbable.*

*Demand  
proposed to  
Seditaries,*

*No Answer  
given,*

6. All that's pleadable against this Discourse is, That our Doctrin once confessedly Orthodox, was changed by the Church in after Ages. Answ. VVe are both willing and ready to discuss, and that most rigidly this particular with Protestants, but before hand giue them one *Caveat*. Viz. That no Topicks, but sound Principles enter here, or bethe last Probation. If then wee produce and most euidently, a list of our Bishops and Pastors euer since Christ, as Witnesses of our Faith. They are to do as much, and produce as many for Protestancy. If we, as we do, enforce Seditaries to name some known Orthodox Society of Christians, that condemned our Doctrin in any Age, they are obliged to vnbequile vs, and show vs where, or when, or by whom,

we were condemned. If finally we vnexceptionably euident  
and glorious Miracles to haue illustrated our Church, euen after  
her fancied Falling from the Primitiue truth, after she became  
the whore of Babylon, our new men must either deny her such  
Miracles (if so, we vrge them to ground the denial on Principles  
equal to our contrary Probations) or will certainly be forced  
to confels, *That God wrought Miracles in à Church, which had brought  
in shameful Errours and quite forsaken the Primitiue Doctrin.* Obserue  
well the force of our Argument. Its improbable to say, That  
God fauoured this Church with the Glory of Miracles, Had  
She falsified His reuealed truths. And it is as wholly impro-  
bable to deny Her the Glory of Supernatural wonders. Sectaries  
worn our Obiections are not worth taking notice of. Some  
oppose the Greeks, though now not of the Church, pretending  
a Succession. We answer if the Pretext be true, Their cause  
vpon that Account is better than Protestants, But withall say,  
though Succession bee euer necessary to demonstrate the  
Church, yet it followes not, *where we haue it, There is the Church,*  
For Other Errours may vndoe all, And *de facto* Vnchurch the  
Greeks, guilty and condemned in three General Councils.  
See Bellarmine *de Notia Ecclesie. Lib. 4. Cap. 8. 6. secundo.*

What secta-  
ries are  
forced to  
grant.

7. Enough is said aboue, and in the other Treatise also. Disc.  
1. C. 10. n. 4. 12. of the Vnion and Sanctity of our Church.  
Vnion in Faith the greatest Blessing hearts can desire, asserted  
by S. Hierome *Epist. 57. ad Damasum* (*Those are prophane who  
turn not the lambe in the Roman Catholick Church*) And innumerable  
other Fathers, knit's together this whole Moral Body amongst  
so many different Nations, different judgements, different man-  
ners, different Education, different times, different places, from  
one end of the world to the other. All belieue as the Pope  
himself belieues, or is no Member of this Church, And here  
is our Glory. Whereas, if on the other side, we cast à sorrowful  
thought vpon all the Hereticks who from the beginning rent  
themselves from the Roman Church, we shall find Diuisions,  
and subdiuisions (Forerunners of Ruin) endlessly following, which

Unity à  
Mark of the  
Church.

Vitally  
destroyed by  
Sectaries.

Mr. Thorndicke's  
Observation

at last destroyed them. From one Luther, as Bellarmin now cited observes. Cap. 10. a hundred Heresies sprouted up, And since his time there are more added to that number in our once most Catholick England. He that can take measure with Mr. Thorndicke, in his late little Book of Forbearance. P. 33. how much of common Christianity is lost by these Divisions in thirty years time since our troubles began, even among them that call them selves Godly and Saints, will easily believe that it (he means Christianity) hath not long to live in that Island, unless Division be put to death.

Englands  
Division  
remediless  
without  
returning to  
the Roman  
Catholick  
Church.

8. A iust iudgement of God vpon them, pointed at by the Prophet Isay. Cap. 19. 1. *I will make the Egyptians to war against Egyptians, and a man shall fight against his Brother: every man against his friend, City against City and Kingdom against Kingdom.* Such confusion such an Abomination of desolation we see now standing in that once holy Nation (Hee that will let him understand) which might iustly draw teares of blood from Compassionate Eyes, Were it not that as S. Hilary notes, *Bellum haereticorum pax est Ecclesie.* The Dissension of Hereticks brings peace to the Church: This some what asswages our Grief, and stints our teares. But the Evil is desperate and incurable, do what Sectaries can, without returning to the Church of Rome which causelessly they have forsaken. And thus much Mr. Thorndicke seem's to Assent, though I know not very well what he mean's by the Roman Catholick Church. He Adds more. P. 127. *We (They in England) are in the State of Schism in spite of our teers, though we are clear our selves of the crime of schism upon the Terms setled. If no Terms excogitable shall clear you from that crime, or can bring you to Settlement, But a perfect Reunion with the ancient and present church of Rome, Whereof enough is said both in this, And the other Treatise.*

9. To speak in this place of the Churches Sanctity, whether we consider the Purity of Doctrin, or the Eminent Holynes of innumerable professing her Faith, would require volumes. I say

*Sanctity  
Eminent in  
the Roman  
Catholick  
Church.*

*Not so with  
Sectaries.*

*Protestancy  
miscalled, a  
Reformed  
Religion.*

in a word, neither Heathen nor Sectary, though caulls are raised against the Orthodoxism of our Doctrin, could yet iustly tax it of too much liberty giuen to Christians. We, contrary to the inclination of nature, fast when Sectaries feast; we humbly confess our Sins to a Priest, they shake of that obligation. Our Church forbid's Marriage to the clergy allowed to Ministers. We in spiritual Affaires submit to one Supreme Head of the Church, They acknowledge no submission to any in points of Belief, but to their own Fancy. We are vnited together in one Ancient Catholick Faith and execrate all Divisions, They are endlessly divided in their Nouelties. We set a high value vpon the pious laudable works of iust men, They esteem all as fordid and sinful. We say God inforceth no man to Sin, they as Caluin confesses, make him both Author and cause of it. I might yet instance in a hundred other particulars, But 'tis needles. The whole world sees that Catholicks, strengthened by the Grace of God, contrary to their interest, and natural Propensions, *even for conscience sake*, Profess and practise more Austerity, Pray more diligently, fast oftner, obserue the lawes of the Church more exactly, And finally doe greater works of Charity than Sectaries either think necessary, or hold Themselues obliged to by virtue of their Religion. I say by *virtue of their Religion* which binds to nothing but only to Believe (though no man knowes what) and consequently giues so much liberty in other matters that it makes the Professors thereof Libertins. Most vniustly therefore doe our new men call Protestancy the reformed Religion, (vnless by an Antiphrasis or contrary way of speaking) when God knowes, it reforms nothing, but contrariwise allowes more then enough relaxation to Corrupted nature. Whence I infer A thing so Indulgent as Protestancy is cannot be from God, who will haue us to curb Sensuality, and vpon that account the Professors of it seem very vnfit to reforme the Doctrin of the Church, were any thing vnfit, whilst the y leaue manners so notoriously Vnreformed, releasing all from the burthen of such Duties, as Christians haue practised from the Beginning.



*The truth  
declared by  
two instances*

10. Be pleased to reflect à little. We haue, thanks be to God, in the Romane Catholick Church many Holy Religious Orders, as *Benedictians, Dominicans, Franciscans &c.* All had their seuerall Founders most eminent in Sanctity and neuer medled with mending Church Doctrin, knowing well that was found and orthodox, But contrariwise endeauored to better the world by their Prayers, Preaching, incessant labours, and virtuous Example. Suppose now any of these had called their Order à reformed Religion and brought Christians by that Reformation to greater Liberty to more Sensuality, than was practised before Their Prayers and Preaching; Would not all most deseruedly haue accounted their Labours mispent and worth nothing? Suppose again that any one would begin to Institute à Religious Family, with these or the like Iniunctions. All of them may Marry, provided they keep *Coniugal Chastity*, All may fast but when the humour takes them, All may profess Pouerty, but experience nothing of the hardship. All may obey but in greater matters only, not in others, freely left to their choise. Would not such à Founder vainly pretend to Reformation, that laies no more Christian Duties on any? Would not euery man look on him as One that peruersts Religion, and laugh at his folly? This is the case in our Protestants mending matters. Therefore I say once more the Reformation is not from God, but à humane and very sensual Inuention. Enough is noted already both here and in the other Treatise of the Efficacy of our Catholick Doctrin Demonstrable to our Eyes and Senses, in the Conuerstions of Nations to Christ. *Maximum Miraculum* Saith *S. Thomas 1. 2. C. 6.* It is the greatest of Miracles, and à manifest Testimony that God Assisterh this Church to doe such wonders. We pass now to consider some Truths, grounded on the Doctrin already deliuered.

*Conuerstion  
of Nations à  
great Mirac-  
le.*

11. One is (and it giues comfort to euery Soul) that our Lord IESUS Christ though Absent from vs, liues yet as it were *Visibly*, shewes himself *Manifestly*, Acts still *Miraculously* in the Mystical Body of our Catholick Church, and the  
seuerall

Disc. 2. C. 10. Of the Catholick Church. 341

several Members Thereof. His Power appears in Her Miracles, His Wisdom in the learned, the certainty of His Doctrin in the Churches Infallibility, The Antiquity of his Truths in Her long continuance. His Mercy appears in the Charitable, His Obedience in the Perfect Religious, His Poverty in thousands who have left all for his love, His Submission in the humble, his wearisome labours in the painful Missioners, His Retirement in Her the Hermits, His Patience in the mortified, His Purity in Virgins, the Efficacy of his Divine word (last mentioned) in the Efficacy of the Churches preaching, His Holy life appears in Her Sanctity, and finally his Sacred death in innumerable glorious Martyrs. Frame then a right Idea of our Blessed Lord, we behold his admirable Perfections Shining in the Church, And contemplating the Church, we see to our unspeakable Solace Christ Iesus, as it were, yet living working in it and by it.

*Christ our Lord works yet in and with the Church.*

*The Church expresses our Saviours perfections.*

12. A second truth. As Things in Nature are not first known by that we call Their interior Essence, but by outward Marks, Qualities, and Effects, whereby we easily distinguish one from another, à Lyon for example from an Elephant, (but doe not so easily, saith Aristotle, distinguish their different essences, known to few). Just so we Discours at present and say the true Church is first evidenced by her Marks, Signes, and Motives, Miracles Antiquity Conversions &c. which being objects of sense lie open to every eye and Collectively taken make, as I said above, this beautiful Spouse as discernable from Heretical Societies, as one Creature is from another by its outward Form and known Proprieties. I do not Assert that the Motives lead to a Scientificall knowledge of the Churches Essential Doctrin; no: For this we believe by Faith, And know not Scientifically; Yet they plainly Mark out the great Oracle, whereby God speaks to the world, And therefore wonder not, that Sectaries strive so earnestly to Obscure the evidence, Their design is to take from vs the clearest Principle which must end Controversies, For cast once off a Church manifested by Antiquity, Miracles, Conversions &c. Nothing remains to regulate Faith,

*The Church first known by her Marks.*

*Why So Ea. vps ends. amount to*

*obſcure like  
Churches  
Luftra.*

but the dark and yet vnſenſed Letter of Scripture, which is moſt groſſly abuſed by the one or other diſſenting Paſty who force vpon it quite contrary Senſes. And by what means can any one come to the knowledge of Him or theſe that abuſe it, if Church Authority be excluded or decide not in this moſt weighty matter? We need not ſaith Mr Thorndicke ( in his Book of Forbearance. P. 2.) The Heresies of the Primitive times tell vs, what Irreligion pretenſes, may be ſet forth in Scripture Phraſe. Our own Fanaticks would furniſh ſpoze enough With the Fooleries they pretend as from Gods Spirit becauſe they can diſſuer their Nonſenſe in the Phraſe of Scripture: Again. Thu two edged ſword of holy Scripture, may proue an edged tooł to cut their ſhins With, who take vpon them, and haue not ſkill to handle it. Much better were it lay I, were the Abuſe or ill handling of the Book only found among a few Fanaticks, But the euil is ſpread further, you Gentlemen are all alike, whether Fanaticks or Proteſtants, that handle, gloſſ, and interpret Scripture by Priuate reaſon, contrary to the Iudgement of an uniuerſal euident Church.

*What theſe  
Motiues  
Speak.*

13. A third Truth. The Church thus manifeſted by Her Marks which are Obiects of Senſe, and induce reaſon to iudge that She only is Gods Oracle; Catholicks neuer call into doubt Her Eſſential owned Doctrin, nor ſeek for further Euidence thereof, becauſe there is none in this preſent State, But humbly ſubmit to all ſhe Teaches. This Euidence then once attained, which ariſeth from the Churches Marks, And hath drawn Millions to belieue her Doctrin, We next turn to our Bible, and learn there, that the Language of theſe Motiues (for *etiam ſancti loquuntur Deum*, ſaith S. Auſtin aboue, God ſpeaks by his works) and the Language of his own written word is one, and the ſame. That is what theſe Inducements point at, God expreſſly delineates in holy Scripture. Obſerue an exact parallel.

14. The Antiquity of our Chnrch, and here is one ſenſible Mark we plead by, giues Assurance that the firſt Founder was our Lord Ieſus Chriſt; No Sectary call's this truth into Queſtion, and the Goſpel confirms it, *Luc. 24. 48. Beginning from Him.*

## Disc. 2. C. 10. Of the Catholick Church. 343

*Videndum* &c. Her Constant Perseuerance, visible in all Ages, proves Her indeficiency And this is manifest in Scripture. A City placed on a Mountain Hill gates shall not prevail against Her. *Communio trium infidelium oculis exhibetur* (saith S. Austin. Lib. Cen. Crest. C. 63. The Church is so well seen by all, that the very Pagans cannot contradict Her. She shewes you a continued Succession of her Popes, Bishops, and Pastors from the beginning, and Scripture also *Ephes. 4. 11. And he gave some Apostles* &c. long since foretold it. She giues in a clear Euidence of Her Miracles through every age, Our Blessed Saviour prophesied it should be so. *Iohn. 14. 12. Maiora horum facient.* They shall work greater wonders. None can deny most Miraculous Conversions of Kingdomes, and Nations to Her Faith, and the Prophets every where Proclaim the truth. *Many Nations shall flock to Her. Zachar. 2. 11.* She Shewes how Her Doctrin was propagated through the whole world, And therefore is called the *Visible Catholick, or Vniuersal Church*, Scripture also Confirm's it. *Dilige omnes gentes. Teach all Nations. Dominabitur a mari usq. ad mare.* She shall raiga from sea, to sea. Finally to say much, in few words, which might be further amplified. Is it true (which the Church demonstrates) that Hereticks, as *Arians, Nestorians, Pelagians, Eutychians, Lutherans, and Calvinists*, once Professed Catholicks, shamefully abandoned Her Vnion, and for that Cause iustly deserved the reproachful name of Hereticks, and Separatists? Scripture Foretells vs of the Breach and Apostacy. *Iohn. 1. 2. 19. Ex nobis prodierunt.* They left vs, *Went out from vs, for had they been of vs they would have remained.* And thus both Church and Heresy are visibly pointed at by clear Marks, and Gods written word also. *Videndum* (it is the Expression of Optat. Mileuit. Lib. 1. a little after the middle) *Quis in radice cum toto orbe manserit, quis foras exierit?* We are to see who They were that continued in the root, with the whole world, and who parted from it. We are to see who erected another Chair distinct from that which was before. Call these and boldly, Hereticks, strikers from the Church, and the Verities of Christs Gospel.

And

God reveals  
in Scripture,

Prophecies  
of Christs  
Church  
fulfilled,

Sectaries  
Vrged to  
Answer.

And here by the way, we vrgē our Nouellists, to point at a visible Orthodox Society, which the Supposed erring Church of Rome abandoned, as clearly as we lay forth to them the time, the place, the circumstances, not only of their own impious Reuolt, But of all other more ancient Hereticks from this Catholick Society. Could the Sectary do thus much, Hee might speak more confidently.

15. To end the matter now in hand You see by what is said already, If Christs words haue weight. *Matth. 18. 16. tran-  
duum vel trium Stet omne verbum*; That Truth stand's firm vpon the Testimony of two or three vnexceptionable Witnessess, We here introduce two Testimonies in behalf of our Church which none can except against. *Gods own voice* speaking to reason by Miracles and the Motiues now mentioned, is *the One*, And his own sacred reuealed word, which most significantly teaches what these Motiues speak, is *the Other*. Hence I say Sectaries cannot dispute against this Church, without proofs drawn from Motiues as strong, and Scriptures as clear as are now alleged in our behalf. We press them again and again to giue in their Euidence, and seriously demand whether Protestancy was confessedly founded by Christ, Or, but once owned Orthodox by any sound Christians, As all acknowledge the foundation of the Roman Catholick and the Orthodoxism of it, to haue been established by Christ our Lord. We further enquire after a visible Succession of their Pastors, after their visible Miracles, their visible Conversions, made in foregoing Ages. Nothing is answered, nothing is or can be pleaded, nothing in a word is returned probable. Therefore Protestancy is an vneuidenced Religion, no Motiues countenance the Nouelty, no Scripture speaks for it, and Consequently cannot but be in the highest degree improbable.

Sectaries  
Gravelled  
at Every  
Question.

16. A fourth Truth. A Church which weares as it were Gods own Liuey and beares the Signatures of Divine Authority in Her Miracles, Prodigious Conuerfions &c. so far Eclipse the false lustre of Heathens, Iewes, and Hereticks, that reason concludes. *In this one manifested Oracle it is*, that Eternal Wisdom

discovers his Divine Truths, Or, there is no such thing as a revealed Truth, taught in the world. This judgement most rational, once well settled in an understanding without further debate, ends all controuersies of Religion. So forceable and perswasive is the language of God's own glorious works.

17. Imagin I beseech you that God should now lay the Heavens open, and evidently declare to the whole world in most significant and clear words, That the Roman Catholick Church is his own faithful Oracle, and exactly teaches those truths he revealed. All, whether Heathens, Jewes or Hereticks, would submit, and, if reasonable yeild Assent to so great an Evidence manifested by words. And what shall his own glorious Works of Miracles, the known language of Heaven, ever spoken since Christianity began proue less perswasive than words, but once only delivered? *Interrogemus Miracula* saith S. Austin cited above, *Quid nobis loquantur &c.* Ask of Miracles what they speak of Christ, demand also what they say of his Church. *Habent enim linguam suam.* They are neither dumbe nor silent Orators. Works therefore speak, and can Answer both for Christ and his Church. S. Pauli Rom. 1. 20. drawes evidence of Gods invisible Perfections, of his Power and Diuinity, from the Creation of the visible effects in Nature, And shall not Christians think ye find evidence enough in the works of grace, (I mean in Miracles and other most Signal Marks) manifest in the Catholick Church, which make it highly Credible That he speaks his eternal verities by this one Oracle? The Evidence in both also well penetrated seem's much à like, call it moral, physical or what you please, whereof more presently.

18. From this Discourse it followes, That à Church demonstrating Gods own Seal and manifest Characters of Truth, so exactly teaches Truth, that none can rationally contradict Her Doctrine, though often difficult to weak Reason. The ground of my Assertion is. Renounce once such an Oracle, we are cast into confusion, and have no other Master to teach Christians, but the obscure Mysteries of Faith, (far enough, God knowes, from

*Gods works  
speak no  
less plainly  
to reason,  
then His  
words.*

*All work is  
Darkness  
without an  
Evidenced  
Church.*



any Self-evidence, ) and the yet not sensed words of holy Scriptures, because the Church which only can, and must interpret, is vpon the Supposition reiected. In this two fold Darknes of obscure Mysteries, and vnensend Words, weak Reason toys as our Sectaries haue done à whole Age, But with what success think ye? S. Peters night labour return's the true Answer, *Tota nocte laborantes nihil cepimus*, All night long vve haue took much paine, yet got nothing. Such is the Fate and Folly of our modern Sectaries, that will vvalk in the dark without the Guidance of à Church, And Her infallible Tradition. Here also we haue the true cause of their endles Dissentions, and multiplicity of Religions, which almost euery year are coyned nevv. All Pulpits faith Mr Thorndicke. P. 5. so ring of this multiplicity, That novv no Religion stand's to be the Religion of that Kingdom.

*The true  
Cause of  
our Sectaries  
endles  
Dissensions.*

19. A fifth Truth. The Sectary that Professeth himself à Christian, and seriously ponder's the Marks, the Signes of Divine Authority openly seen in the Roman Catholick Church, stand's so conuicted of wilful Errour, that practically he is either to renounce Christianity, or obliged to belieue this euenced Church. I proue him First conuicted of wilful Errour vpon these grounds. The Sectary confesseth, or he is no Christian, That this Argument is efficacious against the Iewes. Christ our Lord did greater wonders, shewed more manifest Miracles, than all other Prophets wrought in the time of Iudaism, and from hence He inferrs, or (shall neuer proue it) that Christ is the true Messias. Therefore this Argument is equally pressing against Protestants. The Roman Catholick Church only has evidently done greater Wonders, chiefly in the Conuersion of Nations; She has shewn more manifest vndoubted Miracles than all Protestant Professors in the world, Ergo She is the only true Church, because She beares the Marks, doth the works, and wonders of that great Lord that laid Her foundations firm. Whereas Contrarywise this naked Protestancy, has no resemblance of à Church, but lies in Obscurity, vneuidenced, only known by its own Monstrous

*What our  
Argument  
Proves  
Christ to be  
the true  
Messias  
proves also  
the Catho-  
lick Church  
true.*

by upon this Account, That two hideous Rebels begot it in Pride, and brought it forth in Division to no other purpose, but to fright all that look on it. Again the Sectary, if he be Christian, must hold this Argument Valid against the Jewes. All the Prophecies in Scripture speaking of the true Messias, exactly agree to, and were amply fulfilled, in the Person of Christ our Saviour, and in no other. But the like Argument hold's as strongly in our case. For all the Ancient Prophecies of the true Christian Church whereof we read in the old Testament, As of Her Continuance, Visibilty, and Nations flocking to Her only agree, and are exactly fulfilled in the Roman Catholick Church, And not so much as one appears in this naked Nouelty of Protestancy, ~~try~~ the Roman Catholick Church and not that Fatherles Progeny of Protestants, is the only true Catholick Oracle of Iesus Christ.

10. Lastly this Argument is stronge against the Jewes and Proves them deserted by Almighty God. Since Christ came to Redeeme vs, This abandoned people lie vnder contempt, and are best known vpon the Account of their open iniustice; Wherefore God to set a visible Mark of his wrath vpon them, has not only scattered them vp and down some few corners of the world, but also permitted them to Deuide and Subdiuide into seuerall Sects, and FaCTIONS. But the same Argument is as forceable against Protestants, For first, the whole Christian world abroad slightes the men as *Innauators*, and their Doctrin also as *Nouelties*. *Irish, Semiarrians, Gracians, Abyssins* detest Protestancy, and as highly contemn the Authors of it, as the far extended Church of Rome condemn's both the one, and other.

11. 2. No Iniustice euer done by Iew, except that one wicked fact of crucifying Christ our Lord, is comparable to the open clamorous wronge of Protestants, who without law or right yea contrary to all conscience, violently vsurpe the Ecclesiastical goods in England, and worse than Robbers on the high way appropriate all to Them selues, which neither God nor man intended for them. These Reueneues were given by Catholicks for the Orthodox Pastors and Teachers of our Ancient Religion, that

X x 2

law.

*A visible  
Mark of  
Gods  
wrath. Set  
upon Iewes  
and Secta-  
ries.*

*The open in-  
iustice of  
Protestants.*

lawfully and quietly possessed them for a thousand years, And now behold a Robbery done but one age since, turn's the true Owners out a doores, And serues, forsooth, to intail Church Liuinges vpon Luthers Progeny, open Rebels against the Church. The world neuer heard of greater Iniustice.

22. Now lastly if we speak of different Sects, and endles Diuisions in points of Doctrin, Most vndoubtedly the Dissentions are greater, the Sects more numerous amongst Protestants professing Christianity, than among the very Iewes that professed Iudaism. A iust iudgement of God, A clear Mark of his Indignation, set vpon both. The Sin of the one for deserting Christ, hath scattered that People vp and down the world, And the Sin of Sectaries, for their deserting an Ancient Church, hath more scattered and diuided them into endles erroneous, and most iarring opinions. Vpon these grounds therefore, That Protestants belieue not an Oracle signed with the Marks of our Lord Iesus Christ, That they reiect a Church clearly Propheesied of in holy VVrit, That they lie hid in vneuidenced Conuenticles, And broach Doctrins slighted the whole world ouer; That their open iniustice and robbery cryes to heauen for reuenge, *Psalm 137* I say, They renounce Christ, Church and all Christianity with it. Thus much of the Churches Euidence against Sectaries, we now proceed to a further consideration.

*Diuisions  
more  
amongst  
sectaries  
then la-  
mes.*

## C H A P. X I.

*Christ and his Church made manifest to à Heathen. No Prophet comparable to Christ, no Church comparable to the Roman Catholick. Our glorious Christ Iesus Exhibits à glorious Church. Hee is proved the Only true Messias, And the Roman Catholick Church His only true Spouse. How the Heathen Discourses, if rational, And Prudent.*

Christ and his Church are so easily laid forth to à Heathen, That grant once the Existence of à Power Omnipotent and Infinity wise in the Gouvernement of this world, the main work is done, Reason if it contradict's not Evidences, soon finds out the true and other. Now if as S. Cyprian Discourses, it be à most heinous Offence. *Eum nescire velle quem ignorare non poterant*, not to know God, whom all cannot But know, In like manner say I, it must needs imply à Supine negligence in our present State when Christianity is diffused all Nations ouer, not to come to the true knowledge of Christ and his Church, whilst neither can be concealed. The Heathen then that Own's à God, and desires to serue him, is supposed to demand of Christians, How or in what way, due Honour may be rendred to that infinit Being. For Answer please to bear in mind these Principles, rightly called three stronge Evidences.

*A Deity supposed what the Heathen would Learn is easily learned.*

1. First. True Religion whereby we yeild Honour and due Submission to God, euer bears the *Ensigns of it's Author*, And shoves by certain Marks, it proceeds from God. No Iew nor Gentile, no Heretick can deny the Principle, deliuered in the

*Three principles.*

*Of the  
Greater rati-  
onal Evi-  
dence for  
Gods Truth.*

se general Terms, though Disputes may arise concerning some particular Motives. 2. A greater Evidence of Credibility in Religion, is à certain Mark of its Truth, For whoeuer, whether Heathen, Jew, or Christian, own's that matter of Fact of Moses preuailing against the Egyptian Magicians, Or, of S. Peters Miracle, set against that of Simon Magus, See's well by the force of greater Evidence, That the Prophet and Apostle maintained Truth against these Sorcerers. A third Principle. If there be not à greater excess of rational Evidence, or à stronger Conuiction in behalf of true Religion, than for Sects vnorthodox or false, God is frustrated of his End, And can oblige none to embrace true Religion; For this Obligation necessarily ceaseth if à Spurious Faith could match the Orthodox Religion Or Outuie it in those glorious Wonders which God evidences, And hath manifestly appropriated to His own reuealed Truths only. See more Hereof in the other Treatise. Disc. 1. C. 8 Thus much premised.

*The Heathen  
convinced by  
the manifest  
Signes of  
Gods power.*

3. VVe here Represent in the first place, our Glorious Lord Jesus Christ, the great Master and Author of Catholick Religion, and Ask what credit the Heathen giues to that holy book we call Scripture, or to one Part thereof, which recount's the prodigious wonders wrought by our Sauour. Wil he own them vpon Humane faith (for we urge him not yet to belieue infallibly) as Authentick, or as well deseruing Credit as Cæsars Commentaries, or any other receiued History? If he grants, we Infer These Miracles, far aboue the Power of nature, were Gods own works, and manifestly testified that none since the world began, whether Heathen, Jew, or Heretick, euer paralleld Christ our Lord in the like VVonders. Now, if he wholly flights the Authority of that Book, we proceed further vpon Evidence enough and lay before him those manifest Effects, which in à short time followed our Sauours Preaching, most apparent in the first Propagation of the Gospel, and continual encrease of it. Herein, the Marks, the Ensigns of à Diuine Power clear to sense, speak openly, without contradiction. viz. That no ancient Prophet, no Heathen, no Jew, no Heretick euer oppos-

sed sensuallity so strongly as Christ our Lord did, yet he gained Millions to submit to his law. No Prophet, no Heathen, no Heretick, preached more difficult Mysteries, Yet as the World sees, He hath drawn whole Kingdoms and Nations to belieue his Doctrin. And if you go on, or Ask by what Instrumnts this admirable work was happily accomplished? The Answer is ready. Twelue poor Fishermen, friendles, vnlearned, despicable in the eyes of worldlings, were the chief Oracles. These made the incredulous, *Believers*, Strangers to Christ, his own *Domesticks*, Lofly Spirits, *Submiss* to his law. No Heathen can doubt of such known Effects, signal Euidences, of Gods power, cooperating with Christ, and the first Euangelical Preachers. But because this Argument is most fully handled, in the 4. and 5. Chapters of the first Discourse, I petition the Reader to return hither, And once more to peruse that Discourse, which I hold transferable, and most conuincing for our present intent!

4. To add yet more in behalf of our Glorious Redeemer, and the verity of Catholick Religion (for proue the one, you proue the other) I Propose à second Question to the Heathen, and Ask, Whether our Blessed Lord, who called himself the long expected Messias, and the true Son of God, *Spake Truth*, or contrarywise, most impudently Assumed to himself that so high Prerogatiue? Grant the first. He was indeed the true Son of God, and the wonders he wrought, were Gods own works, Therefore Christian Faith stands firm, vpon Eternal Truth manifested by most glorious Signes. Say. 2. That Impostor like, Hee falsly made himself the Son of God, when he was no more but à Cheat. It followes first. That either God positiuely intended to draw the world into gross Error by his Perfidious Preaching (which is horrid to think) or we must grant, that his Gracious Prouidence long before this day, should by one euident sign or other, by some Notorious Mark of dishonour, haue made manifest the *Legerdemaine*, the Imposure of this supposed Deceiuer. It followes. 2. That the Iewes who crucified our Blessed Lord iustly deserved vpon that Account Renown and Honour, yea, the highest Re-compence

An vnu-  
werable  
Dilemma.

Refect Gtts  
Reader  
vpon these  
Consequen-  
ces.



352 Disc. 2. C. 11. *Christ and His Church*

compence, For it was à laudable fault to condemn à Camerlin, & openly wicked as dared to call Himself the Son of God, When Hee was not. Perkin Warbecks disguise, was but à Peccadillo compared to this shameful coulenage. The sin of Mahomet who neuer made Himselfe God but à Prophet only, came not neer the Malice of this one supposed abhominable loud Vntruth. It follows. 3. That our supposed Impostor (I haue à horror to pronounce the word) desertedly merited, And yet merit's for His excusable Hypocrisy, eternal Reproach, contempt and ignominy, in the iust judgement of God, men, and Angels. Hence I Argue.

5. God is iust, and hath Providence ouer the world, But our iust and wise God neuer since Christianity began, Set Mark or Sign of Ignominy, vpon our Blissed Saniour, as he hath done vpon other Impostors. Our iust and wise God euer since that wicked People nailed him to à Cross, hath been so far from honouring them or rewarding Their impious Fact That, most visible, and seuerer Punishments haue proued the only Recompence and best Reward. The Temple ruined, their Dispersion followed vp and down the world, where they liue contemptible, chiefly infamious for Hypocrisy, and Auarice. (Se also this Argument more enlarged about Chap. 2. n. 4.) Our most iust God, hath not only taken of all Marks of Ignominy, but evidently to our Senses declared by real Effects His innocent Lamb our lonely Saniour worthy of Honour Benediction, and Glory. So true it is, We read. *Apocal. 5. 13. Dignus est Agnus, qui occisus est &c.* The iust Tribute of Prayse and Glory is visibly paid him (so Providence hath ordained) not only by Kings, Princes, Learned and vnlearned, by all Nations far and neer, But by the very Turkes also.

6. And is it possible (reflect I beseech you) that God who is no Exceptor of Persons, could haue punished so dreadfully, these abandoned Iewes, had they done well, in crucifying our Lord Iesus? Is it possible, that his iust, and wise Providence, could euer haue crowned à Counterfeit with so much Honour and renown, as our Saniour hath gained, or permitted A the

*Christ honoured the Iewes condemned.*

*God's iust Iudgement.*

not

is only to be Reuerenced as the true Son of God so long (though he was not) but moreouer to draw so many Millions and Millions of Souls into errour as believed in him, for seven Ages and more. The Paradox is so desperate so highly improbable, That one would as soon deny both God and Providence, As once seriously harbour it in his thoughts. Obtaine my Reason.

7. The Light of nature dictates, abstracting from Authority  
 Rom. 1. 9. That as on the one side, *Shame, Ignominy, and Confusion* pursue horrid Workers of iniquity, So on the other, *Glory, Honour* and renown inseparably follow the manifestly declared just, and innocent. But Shame, Confusion, and Ignominy, *Gods iust Signes of indignation*, yet visibly follow that wicked race of People, the Authors of our dear Sauours death, contrarywise, *Glory and renown*, euer since he dyed, haue been his due reward, and own inheritance. Therefore if God speaks, as He doth, *by these signal Effects of Iustice*, The Iewes so long severely punished, stand like guilty Criminals in that high Tribunal of Heauen, *There sentenced answerable to their Desert as Workers of iniquity*; And our Holy Lord Iesus, so long honoured the whole world ouer, receiues the contrary Sentence, And is by visible effects there proclaimed just and Innocent. *A Domino factum est illud &c.* It was not chance but a Signal work of Providence, that the *Strong* these Builders reiected, became so glorious as to support the noblest Fabrik God euer made.

*Prove our  
Saviour  
Innocent.*

*And the  
Iewes  
Criminal.*

8. Apply what is is now said to the Roman Catholick Church, We shall se an exact Parallel of proofs, deliuered in the same Terms.. Christ our Lord called Himself *Eternal Truth* in all he taught. Our Church stil's Herself, Gods own Oracle, in all she teaches, Now whilst so high a Prerogatiue is claimed, She either speaks Truth or lies most impudently. Grant the first Viz. That this Church speaks Truth, she is to be believed in all she teaches, Say secondly, she falsly makes Herself Gods own Oracle, when she is not, Diuine Providence which cannot dissemble, nor Design to ruin Souls by the false Doctrin

*A true  
Application  
of this whole  
Doctrin.*

To the  
Roman  
Catholick  
Church.

She flourisheth.

of an infatuated Oracle, would long before this day, have either destroyed Her, or marked Her out as a Cheat by some evident Sign of Justice, as he hath marked other false Oracles (namely, Turks, Infidels, and Hereticks) with Contempt, ignominy, and Disgrace. The sin is so hideous, that it well deserved a greater Punishment, and would have been inflicted upon this Church also if the Supposition stand: Unless as is now said, we Allow (which is abominable) that Gods express Will was, that She should poyson whole Nations for so many Ages with corrupted Doctrin. But All is contrary. To our unspeakable comfort the Roman Catholick Church fail's not, She keep's her Posture still. She flourisheth every where; even amongst thousands and thousands that dare not (interest will have it so) Profess Her Doctrin, And without any least Note of infamy proceeding from God, (what Devils or Malin spirits or vint against Her, we know) Teaches not only, the most pious and learned in this near world, But the wisest also of the whole Vniuerse. Thus we discoursed of Christ our Lord, and the Argument holds strongly in behalf of our Church.

Made  
renowned,

9. Again. Hath God whose Counsels are just, Crowned our Saviour with Glory and Renown? Has he also who knows well where to inflict Punishment, manifested his Wrath upon an vitigious People that condemned Him? Ponder I beseech you first, How visibly Providence has made his own Spouse the Roman Catholick Church, Renowned; And wonder not, the Son of God paid dear for the Renown, and gave his life for it. *Vt exhiberet ipse sui gloriosum Ecclesiam.* Ephe. 5. 27. That he might exhibit and present to Himself and the whole world a most glorious Church. All this, I say, visibly Appears, to our eyes and senses.

Leues and  
Heretiques,

10. Ponder. Where and vpon whom, God hath set Mark of ignominy, and inflicted most rigorous Punishments. Vpon Leues only, that opposed and condemned Christ? Or these only Marked and Chastised? No. Those rebellious Spies also, Those first Renegados, I mean the chief Arch-hereticks

that oppressed and condemned his Church, Vile, and abject in life, dying, felt Gods heavy hand of Justice. *Manichæus* was strangled. *Montanus* hanged Himself. *Arius* voided out his bowels and filthy soul together, in a Priuie. God strook *Iulian* the Apostate dead, and the ground opening swallowed vp his carcasse. *Nestorius* wicked worm-eaten tongue brought the wretch to a miserable end, And *John Calvin* consumed with vermine, dispaire dyed like an other *Herode* or *Antiochus*. I need not Here relate any thing of *Luthers* sudden death after his merry supper. Read *Bellarmin. Lib. 4. de vana Ecclesia C. 17.* where you haue these, and other more fearful Examples of Gods Seuerity.

*Seuerly  
Punished.*

11. Finally must we say, that our Lord *Iesus* is proued no Impostor vpon these reasons, That no false Prophet since the Creation purchased the like vniuersal Fame, None euer had so vniuersal an Applause, or the like Tribute of praise paid Him? Is it true? That euer since Christianity began, the powerful hand of Providence hath not only rescued our Holy *Iesus* from all Reproach (iustly merited) but moreouer by signal Effects of indignation, made his Enemies contemptible? Nothing can be more manifest. You may then boldly Conclude in like manner. The Roman Catholick Church is as demonstrably proued no Chace but an Oracle of truth, vpon the same grounds. Her vniuersal visible Extent, the continued succession of Her Pastors, the Conuerfions, and Miracles wrought by Her inuite all with a loud *Veniis Adoremus*, incite all, not only to behold and Praise this magnificent Building, but also to Adore the Founder of it, For, if it be true as was said above, that the visible works in nature point at God the only Author of them. *Celi enarrant gloriam eius*, The Heauens declare his Glory. It is also clear, that these visible Effects of grace, Miracles, Conuerfions obuius to euery Eye, set forth the glory of the Roman Catholick Church. Now how deservingly she hath gained this Renown, let the world judge.

*The Renown  
of the Roman  
Catholick  
Church.*

12. *Wisdom*, saith *Salomon*, *built Himself a house. Proverb. 9. Where*

*Pillars*

*How gained*  
*Heretiques*  
*despicable.*  
*Other ad-*  
*vantages in*  
*the Church.*  
 Edifice stand firm, & Table is plentifully furnished, Victims are immolated &c. The whole Passage. S. Cyprian. Lib. 1. Epist. 3. Applies to the great Sacrifice of the Altar offered vnder the Form of bread, and wine. I waue the Application and vige only an euident truth, And Tis, that Our Church built vpon Christ the Corner-Stone, vpon those stronge Pillars the Apostles, hath stood firm sixteen Ages, and here is Her Glory. For if Glory (witness S. Ambrose) be nothing els, but *Clara cum laude uirtus*. A clear knowledge with Fame and Renown, The long Continuance and ample extent of this Church, could we say no more, hath iustly purchased Her a large Renown the whole world ouer. Now mark where the contempt lies, which is a bale Esteem of a thing vnworthy value. All know the Arians built, the Pelagians built, the Donatists and other Hereticks built, but their vnsteady disordered Houses soon fell down, and came to nothing. What saies Reason when Ruins are compared with this long standing Edifice?

13. Next cast a serious thought, vpon the Inhabitants of this house of God. You will find all vnited in one Faith adoring one Iesus Christ, louing one Mother his spouse, looking on one last End, Their hope and Happines And if through frailty differences doe arise abating charity, our Advantage is in about all other Societies in the world: Wee haue a supreme Pastor (God be euer-blessed) that can command, and like a Father exhort to peace, in Abrams language. *No finis quæsi iuris* &c. Laies must not be in the house of God, *Frater enim sumus*. For we are all Children of one louing Mother. Here is the Churches Glory. Whereas on the Contrary side, nothing but Discord, and that remediless, the known euil of Lucifers pride, And in the highest points of Faith, inseparably haue the rambling Fancy of such, as haue wilfully diuorced themselves from this one vnited Society. And Here is matter enough of Contempt, and Compassion also.

14. In the last place consider well the vast multitudes who are, and haue been Domesticks in this house of God. In the

very Entrance we meet those *Candidati admirandi* (as Tertullian speaks) Nourishes of Eternity, the newly admitted by the Sacrament of Baptism, and no Society of Christians can show the like number. Here we have Cherubins admirable in Knowledge, Doctors I mean, profoundly learned, Seraphins inflamed with Divine love, that rest in the height of Contemplation. Here we find Penitent Souls bewailing their sins, innumerable Martyrs shedding their blood for Christ, numberless laborious Missioners travelling far and near to propagate His sacred Gospel. Here finally we have (for tis long to recount all) Abrahams glorious multiplied Starrs. *Gen. 15. 5.* Kings and Queens, whole kingdoms and Nations professing the Faith of this one Church. *The Gentils walk by Her light, and Princes in the brightness of Her rising. Lift up thy eye and see, saith holy Isaias, All these assembled together: And if you Ask what the duty was, and yet is of so many conuened Multitudes? The Royal Prophet, that long since forso in Spirit a continual Oblation offered vp, Answers? Psal. 9. 1. In templo quoniam dicunt gloriam.* All in this Temple and sacred House shall incessantly render praise, and glory to God, the Author of so noble a Structure, Therefore *Psal. 36. 2.* He rightly Concludes. *Christi dicta sunt de te O Civitas Dei.* Glorious things are spoken of thee, O City of God: Thou beganst In Hierusalem, wast afterward extended to all Nations, becamst permanent, and because permanent, Glorious. Thus that whole Psalm, speaking mystically of Christs Holy Church. These are Truths not only proved, as you se by Scripture, but also evident, (and this I urge) to our eyes, and senses. Now next consider those scattered, dissipated, and iarring Multitudes of Heathens, Iewes and Hereticks, And let reason, if a spark of it liue in any, iudge, whether this be not evident without Dispute. Vix. *That as no Prophet ever came near to Christ our Lord in glory and renown, So no Society of men since the World stood, was, or is, comparable to our glorious Roman Catholick Church, All other besides this happy united moral Body appear as they are, abject, and contemptible.*

*The Inhabitants of the house of God, numberless.*

*A Parallel of Christ and His Church.*



15. And thus we Evidence Christ our Lord and his Church to a prudent Heathen, not first by making the intrinsic Reasonableness of the essential Doctrine the main Proof of its verity, as Mr Stilling: simply Argues, above. *Disc. 1. C. 9.* (For it is truly ridiculous to draw the Pagan to believe a Doctrine, as reasonable and Divine, whilst yet he knowes not, vpon any rational Inducement, whether it be from God, or no) But this way takes effectually. When you lead him on by a clear light extrinsecal to the Doctrine, when you set before his Eyes, such Marks, Signes and wonders as cannot but proceed from God, *Miracles Conuincens deo.* When you Shew him How strangely the Doctrine of Christ and his Church, though sublime and difficult, was miraculously Spread the whole world ouer; when you Demonstrate how manifestly Diuine providence hath Age after Age Honoured Christ and his Church, and seuerely Chastised the professed Enemies of both. When finally you make it manifest that there is no Vnion, no Form, no fashion of Religion in any Society now on earth, but in the Roman Catholick Church only. Then the Heathen, if reasonable and desirous to learn Truth, must confess that God speaks Truth by this one Catholick Oracle only, Or there is no such thing as a reuealed Verity taught in the world.

*How the  
Heathen is  
Conuinc'd.*

16. Out of what is said already I infer first. If that Maxim of Philosophy be vndoubted, *Fructus sit per plura &c.* It is needles to multiply many proofs in behalf of a Verity, when one most clearly conuinceth it. This Argument alone, drawn from the glorious Marks of our Catholick Church, which cannot but proceed from God, proues Her his own faithful Oracle, and these Signes we haue the thing signified. These in a General way settle in euery reasonable vnderstanding this fundamental Truth. *God speak's to the World by his evidenced Church.* I say in a General way. For as the visible works in nature, proue this General Truth. *Ipsa fecit nos &c.* A mighty power made vs, we thank not our Selues, though as yet none comes thereby to an explicit knowledge of many Perfections in God; So the Marks and Motiues manifest in the Church, conuince this General Truth also.

*The efficacy  
of Church  
Motiues.*

16. That the same Power which made Nature gives being to these, the same Power which preserves nature, preserves these glorious Signs for our instruction, And Consequently it follows, That as the visible world is proved Gods own work, so this visible glorious marked Church is proved his own Oracle, Though yet neither the Heathen nor any knowes every particular Doctrin, which God teaches by the Church. In like manner great Divines assert, that Christs own Disciples owned first our blessed Lord as the true Messias, and a great Prophet. *Ioh. 1. 41. Invenimus Messiam*, We have found the Messias, before they learned the other high Mysteries of his being the natural Son of God, the second Person of the Blessed Trinity, the Redeemer of Israel &c. see Suarès. 3. *Part. Tom. 2. Dispu. 31. Art. 4.*

17. A second Inference. The General Truth now spoken of well established. *God teaches the world by a Church* Signed with Supernatural wonders, All further disputes cease concerning the particular Doctrins She teaches, though sublime and above the reach of our weak Capacities. For none, whether Heathen, Jew, or Heretick, can boggle at a Doctrin which God reveals, But God, saith prudent Reason, reveals such and such Truths, the *Revelation of the Divine Word*, the *Trinity*, *Original sin* &c. by a Church which most pressing Motives evince to be His own Oracle; Therefore it is my duty to Submit and believe every Doctrin She proposes.

*How reason  
discovers  
upon these  
Evident  
Motives.*

18. The Ground hertof seem'd clear. For as there can be no endless Progress or going on in *infinitum* in the intrinsical-formal Object of Faith, because Faith at last rests vpon one true Principle, An *infinite Verity*, So we can have no endless Progress in the extrinsick Light, and Motives, whereby we are induced to fix a firm Belief vpon that one *first Principle*. Therefore In what ever Society of men Reason finds these Motives, it rests, without further Enquiry after stronger, which cannot be found, But most evidently reason finds them in one only Oracle the Roman Catholick Church (as is now proved) and prudently reflects

Scripture not  
so immedi-  
ately Credi-  
ble as the  
Church,

resteth there as vpon lights which immediately manifest the Church, and make Her Doctrin evidently credible. Scripture, it is true, is the object of Faith, but not so immediately credible as the Church, for independently of Scripture, I can believe the Church as the first Christians did before the Book was written, but men generally in this present State cannot believe Scripture without the Churches Testimony, As is already, and shall hereafter be proved more at large.

19. A third Inference. Who euer pretend's to à Doctrin revealed in Scripture and hold's it of Faith, has either à Church which teaches it evidenced by the Marks of our Lord Iesus Christ, or He publisheth à falshood. Which is to say in other Terms. If the evidenced Church of Christ positively own's not, or reiects such à Doctrin, that Doctrin, *Ex ipso*, is spurious, forged, and not *de Fide*. Hence it is, that when our Blessed Lord, Commissioned the Disciples to Preach his sacred Verities. Math. 28. 39. *Go and teach all Nations*. Hee sent them abroad with the Characters, Marks, and Ensigns, of his own Preaching. Mark 16. 2. *Our Lord Working with all, and confirming the Word with Signs that followed*. And here by the way, I can never sufficiently admire the open folly of Sectaries, that wholly Churchless, will yet needs perswade vs into new opinions vpon their own bare word, That they *teach truth*. It is impossible. Nay I say more, Although (which is false) they should speak Truth, they ought not (Churchless as they are) to be listned vnto. For suppose one should present himself as an Embassadour from à Prince to à foreign State, but without *Credentials*, or Authentick letters vnder his Embassage, no State can or will admit him, though he speaks truth. He must not only do so, but show his Authentick Commission that he speaks truth, deliuered by the Princes own order, or he is sent back vnreceiued in the quality of an Embassadour. In like manner I say. No more can any one essentially vncommissioned pretend to teach Christs Doctrin, whilst he is not sent to teach by Christs own evidenced Oracle, than this vncommissioned Legate to speak in his Princes name. Many à

A lawful  
Mission re-  
quired to  
teach our  
Christian  
truths.

An Instance

man

man knowes the law well, and is fit enough to pronounce à iust Sentence, yet sitt's not on the Bench nor giues it, because he is not Authorised to do so. And thus we discours of all Hereticks, no members of the euidenced Church, though, as I said, they deliuer truth by chance, they yet deserue not the hearing, wanting power and Authority to teach it.

10. S. Cyprian Epist. 2. Speak's very pertinently to our present purpose. *Quod vero ad Naxatiani personam pertinet &c.* For as much as concerns Nouatians Person, I would, dear Brother, haue you know in the first place, we are not to be curious concerning what he saies, when he teaches out of the Church. *Quisquis ille est, & qualicumque est, Christianus non est, qui in Christi Ecclesia non est.* Whoeuer, or of what condition soeuer he be, is no Christian, that is not in the Church of Christ. And hence S. Austin in his frequent Disputes with the Donatists, presseth this point most efficaciously, *Lib. de unit. Eccles. Cap. 2. Quæstio inter nos versatur, ubi sit Ecclesia verum apud nos aut illos?* Here lies the main Business, where the Church is, whether with vs or them? Again, *Epist. 162. Quæritur verum vestra an nostra sit Ecclesia Dei.* We demand whether yours or ours be the Church of God, which must be known, saith Optat. Mileuit. *Lib. 2.* By Her Marks, and Characters. And therefore we said above, though S. Austin made vse of Scripture against the Donatists, it was not done to decide euery particular Controouersy by the bare and obscure words of that holy Book. No. The profound Doctor aymed not at such impossibilities, his whole drift being to teach the Donatists à great Verity, which we all subscribe to. viz. That Scripture once admitted as Gods word, without Dispute, clearly demonstrat's the Church by Her visible sensible Marks, Antiquity, Miracles, Conversions, *Digitis demonstrari potest*, We can point at Her with our finger saith S. Austin. The Church therefore thus manifested we haue enough, and rely on Her as à faithful Oracle in euery Doctrin She professeth. Se Cardinal de Richelieu. *Traicté pour convertir ceux qui* *Lib. 2. C. 7. §.* *C'est encore.* Where he exactly renders

S. Cyprian  
Confirm's  
the Doctrin.

How Scrip-  
ture mani-  
fests the  
Church.

362 Disc. 2. C 11. *Christ and His Church &c.*

S. Anstins meaning conformable to what we deliuered. *Disc.*  
I. C. 14. n. 10.

21. The last Inference. If all are bound to embrace true Religion, All haue also with the obligation means to know where it is taught, But the means to know this lies not in the essential Verity thereof, for that is no *Self-evidence*, or manifestly true *ex Terminis*. The means to know it is not found, in the high Mysteries of Faith, for these (far above the reach of humane vnderstanding) remain yet in darkness without More light. Scripture alone makes not its own Diuinity known, and though it did so, And the Heathen owned it as most Diuine, yet when he evidently discouers that dissenting Christians *Sense the book quite contrary waies*, he has not the means to learn what true Religion is, or where it is taught. Thus then He must Discours, or belieue nothing.

22. God thar's Truth, reueal's the Verities of true Religion. If so, some vnited Society of men teaches what euer God reueal's, for Angels are not our Doctors. I find, Saith the Rational man, great Signes of truth amongst the Christians, and after many a serious thought Cast vpon a Matter of highest Concern, I find also that all those Signes, as Antiquity, Vniuersality, a visible Succession of Pastors, euident Miracles, which cannot but proceed from God, belong to one only Christian Society, the Roman Catholick Church. I se moreouer a strange benign Providence held forth in preserving Her from innumerable attempts of Aduersaries. No Iew, no Heathen, no Heretick can show the like Signal Marks and Proofs, of Gods love, as this one Catholick Oracle demonstrat's. Therefore all other Societies are false Sects misled by erring Prophets, according to Christs own Prediction. *Math. 24. For there shall rise false Christs*, though they clamour neuer so loud. *Ecce hic est Christus*. Loe we preach Christ, and his truths. Thus Reason rest's satisfied, yet because the Heathen see's whole Armies banding against the Church, and rationally hold's their Arguments,

*The Hea-  
thens pru-  
dents Dis-  
course.*

*and Con-  
clusion.*

Arguments like their cause very weak, He is desirous to have the Fallacy of some chiefe Aduerſaries laid forth to his reason, For your Satisfaction be pleased to read the following chapter.

## CHAP. XII.

*The Aduerſaries of the Romam Catholick Church plead unreasonably. A Discouery of their fallacies. The cause of all Errorr concerning Religion.*

*The only means to remedy Errorr.*

**T**He enemies of the Roman Catholick Church are chiefly reduced to these four Classes, to *Atheists*, *Heathens*, *Jews*, and *Hereticks*. A word briefly of their fallacies in order. Some Atheists there haue been (and perhaps Lucian was one), that to cast off all thought of Religion more expressly denyed Diuine Prouidence, than they did the Existency of a God. And a chief Argument to omit others of less weight, is much to this sence. A *Namen* Infinitely wise and powerful, shewes his careful Prouidence in gouerning the world; But an euident Principle opposes this careful Prouidence, and no contrary Principle of equal strength Seem's to establish it, Therefore reason well denies Prouidence. Now here is the euident Principle. The Oppression of iust men, manifest to our eyes, the preuailing of the wicked against the iust, of Turks against Christians, to say nothing of other much visible Confusion and Disorder, proue a neglect of Prouidence, and no contrary Principle half so strong or euident conuinces it, none counterpoises the weight of this clear proof now hinted at, ergo Reason, reasonably denies Prouidence. Thus the Atheist. The Pagan Argues, That Religion is false

*The Atheists  
Plea.*

which



*How the  
Heathens  
and Iewes  
Argue.*

which holds Mysteries ridiculous, and impossible, but Christians teach that God is one Essence, and three Persons. Both seem impossible. The Iewes vapour against à crucified Saviour, and by its unworthy God to become man, and to dye ignominiously vpon à Cross. Lastly our modern Sectaries that own Christ, come limping after the rest, and except much against the Roman Catholick Church. She, Say they, has changed the ancient Articles of the Primitiue Faith and introduced Nouelties in lieu of them. She maintains errors contrary to sense in Her Doctrine of Transubstantiation; And much more seem's amiss.

2. I say first. All these and the like Arguments are meer vnfound Paralogisms; and proue iust nothing against Prouidence, against Christ, or the Roman Catholick Church. Before I discover the fallacies be pleased to note. 1. That God whose existence we haue proued. *Disc. 1. C. 2.* is à Being incomprehensible, and far transcend's the reach of our narrow Capacities. The very Gentile Philosophers owned the truth agreeing in this Principle, That humane reason is as weak to know what God and diuine Mysteries are; as an owle is to behold the Sun at noon-day. Note 2. Reason in man, often too bold enters into Diuine Mysteries, though conscious it walks in à Labyrinth not so much as half-sighted in the search it makes, and this less than Half-sight into Diuine truths, is the cause of Atheism, of all Heresy and the most gross errors now reigning in the world. The Apostle. *2. Tim. 3. 7.* Points at the misse. *Semper discites.* They are alwaies learning, but neuer come to the knowledge of truth. Note 3. Reason in the inuestigation of Religion and Diuine verities, may tend two different waies, *Directly*, and *Reflexly*. Direct reason, as is now said, fall's vpon some great Mystery in faith, finds it harsh, yea most difficult to be vnderstood, and What follows? The faint man with his feeble reason either reiect's the Mystery, or remain's so perplexed in the search that he can resolute nothing. His procedure is iust like à man vnskilful in Musick, that hearing one Note alone which seem's harsh, slight's all without more Aduice, whereas he should listen to the whole Harmony before he iudges

*Principles  
permitted  
to solve the  
se Objections.*

In like manner we often proceed with God by a Half-pondering Divine Mysteries. Contrariwise, reflex Reason labours not to Conquer difficulties by it self, or any half consideration but prudently waives that way, and has recourse to a surer Principle, whether more presently. Thus much premised.

3. A second Proposition. The fallacy, of Atheists in their Arguments against Providence, chiefly arises from this; That the direct Judgment of weak reason runs headlong into Mysteries considered only by halves or in themselves, without attending to the Solution, most easily attained by a Judgment which is reflex and Prudent. For example. The Atheist denies Providence because just men suffer, and the impious Prevail against the just, and hence infer's negligence in God: Here is one harsh unseemable Note to his ears, but reflect's not First, That, that which he calls Nature is as negligent, and much worse left alone without God: He reflect's not. 2. That if God were supposed to Rule the world, there would yet be fools enow to find fault, and think some thing amiss in the Government. He reflect's not. 3. That if God be an intellectual Being infinitely wise, his thoughts are as far above our thoughts as the Heavens above earth, And therefore adventures desperately to reject Providence which his shallow head neither doth, nor can Understand. Finally He neuer reflect's, that to deny all divine Foresight cast's Reason into more Mazes, than to grant it; For deny it, we must say, That this admirable and well ordered work of nature Govern's it self. The Sun, Moon, and Stars, move themselves. We must say, That the vast and swift circulation of these Celestial Bodies depend on no Superiour cause; unless we faine many unknown invisible Gods, or Genii, Error of themselves, And say These run about with the Heavens, and regulate that admirable Motion. But to Assert this without Proof offer's more violence to our intellectual Faculties than to own one powerful Being, essentially wise, and therefore Vigilant over all Hée Govern's. In a word you see here, this great Fabrick of Nature ( some rightly compare it to a Clock or Watch)

*The fallacy  
of Atheists  
Discovered*

*What they  
are forced  
to grant  
against  
Reason.*

and find in it nothing like confusion, but contrarywise a lovely Order, a Harmony most gracious befitting God, Yet say the foolish of the world, we are to diuorce it from his sacred Providence: That is, the Clock can moue, the wheeles can turn about without a Superiour hand that winds all vp, and orders all. And why I beseech you? Mark the reason of such as haue no Reason. Free Causes, men I mean indued with Liberty, abuse liberty oppress the iust, raise tumults, breed confusion, and Scramble who can get the greatest heap of dust together; Ergo saith the half ey'd Atheist, (*respiciens ad payca*) there is no care had of vs, which is to say. Men comply not with their Duty but abuse their own Free will, Therefore God is blameable because he either makes them not meer Animals, Brutish, or forces not Virtue vpon them against their wills. Its an Errour.

*The abuse  
of liberty  
redound's  
not to God.*

4. Thus much then concern's God. To indue rational Creatures with Liberty to command the right vse of it; but not to be responsible or held neglectiue, if They abuse it. No, this rouches them (for T'is their own work) that doe Euil. Let then the Euil remain where it is ( Providence can forgiue, but not forget.) And seriously consider the lovely Harmony, the recreateue Order visible in the works of Nature ( here is Gods own admirable Oeconomy ) doe only thus much, and reason so evidently discover's a depth of Wisdom in these works, that it cannot but exclaim with the wise man, *Sup. 14. 3. Tui o Pater prouidentia gubernas.* Your Providence, o Father, gouerns all. This done cast your thoughts again as much as you will vpon the Monsters in nature, which man freely beget's, and freely bring's forth. What folowes I beseech you but thus much only? That God, after so many menacings so much Terroure laid before vs if we transgress, leaues liberty to its own free choise, and will seuerely punish the Offenders; But that Spurious Progeny of euil Works he own's not. Therefore no Argument can haue force against Providence vpon this account, That liberty is permitted to act as liberty requires, without Compulsion. Were God forgetful or negligent, would he not, or could he not punish sin now, or hereafter. *Amos*

*Liberty is  
left to act  
without  
compulsion.*

Atheists might vapour more boldly; But hereof there is no danger, for nature it self leaues this deep impression in all (let who will Govern it) that one supreme Regent hates Iniquity, and that as he often doth visibly in this life, So he will more rigidly take Reuenge in the future. *Mibi vindicta: & Ego retribuam.* Rom. 12.

19. And this consideration alone of both present (most clear) and future Punishments, so blunt's and dead's the Atheists Plea, that their best Arguments fall to nothing, and are indeed resolved into pure Non-sense. This consideration alone, that God will reward the must sufferings of the Virtuous, is comfort enough for them, and euery rational prudent Creature.

20. We are next to dispatch the main business with these Adversaries, who desire to haue as strong Proofs in behalf of Providence, as they allege against it. I will therefore for the better Satisfaction of all, produce three most conuincing Arguments. One is, The Deity we all Adore is not inexorable, but, as clear and manifest Experience teaches, and most known History in all Ages relates, hear's often the Prayers of iust men in time of Tribulation releasing them from sudden danger, when no humane Power can help in the Exigency, Innumerable after earnest Prayer and hands lifted vp to Heauen, haue found speedy Assistance, some in the peril of Shipwrak escaped, others thrown to hungry lions haue been left vntouched, others cast into the fire not so much as scorched, volumes might be writ of such particulars. Therefore there is a Supreme Numen, that has care of vs, the Sun, Moon, and Starrs hear not, nor can lend ayde in such pressing Necessities, And to requir to no man knowes what invisible Spirits, is, as we now said, less intelligible and far more difficult, than to own one powerful Being of Himself that both can and doth relieue at his good Pleasure.

*One clear  
proof of Pro-  
vidence.*

21. 2. The knowledge of future things Sublime, and aboue the reach of all Creatures, Argues a Power Omniscient, and Omnipotent. The reason is. The Prenotion of what's to come, not yet limited to any Being in it selfe, nor as yet determinately existing, necessarily arises from an Infinite Knowledge

and

*The know-  
ledge of fu-  
ture things  
proves a Po-  
wer Omni-  
scient.*

and efficacy of light, which extends it Selfe to what ever can be known; for that power which comprehend's things future, much more comprehend's all past and present, and therefore has an infinit Extent, which we call *Omniscience*. Now I subsume. But an Intellectual power is in being, that by virtue of *his own light* knowes future Truths wherof none can doubt, because he has actually communicated part of his knowledge to others, For example, to the Ancient Prophets, who most exactly foretold things to come relating to Christ our Lord, and the Glory of his Church; Such Secrets highly Divine, they had not as men nor were they known by any Principle within the bounds of Nature, therefore God *Omniscient* imparted all; And he did so not in vain, but for this great End, That mortals may see how an infinit Goodness condescend's to inform vs of Truths whereby he manifestly tender's our Happiness, And this alone demonstrat's Providence. That the Prophets foretold truths to come is evident by the books of Scripture, writ whole ages before they happened, and the Event visible to our eyes, proves the verities of the Predictions. What haue your Astronomers who more often miss then hit in their Predictions comparable to these Prophecies in Scripture? Nothing at all, if (which deserves reflection) we consider the *Emnency*, the *Depth*, and high importance of the Mysteries reuealed.

7. My last proof taken from one Manifest Absurdity, is no less than demonstratiue. Suppose Providence be denied, it followes, That those Millions of men who since the worlds Creation adored God, whereof innumerable were wise, spright, and holy, haue all been besotted and stupidly beguiled in adoring that which is not. Nay more, This also is consequent, That a few abiect, ignorant, and despicable Atheists, are only indowed with the light of a Truth, which once established, makes *Virtue odious*, *Honesty*, and *Goodnes highly contemptible*. I proue the consequence. If Providence be a chimera, All our acts of Reuerence, of Fear, Obedience, Religion and Gratitude tendered to God, essentially blessed with that fore-seeing Power

*A third and  
most convinc-  
ing  
Proof.*

are dissonant to reason, and in themselves abominably sinful. Contrarywise, All acts of Contumely, of Blasphemy, and Contempt of Prouidence, are consonant to reason, and most laudable. The more therefore, we blaspheme, contemn Diuine Prouidence, the more laudably we operate, and as highly merit praise, as one doth that contemn's an Idol set before him to worship. For Prouidence, Say Atheists, is an Idol, Ergo to adore it is madness, to contemn it, most Praise worthy. These and other like Sequels are so harsh, so Abominable, and contrary to the light of nature, that I think the boldest Atheist now liuing, dare not in à serious moode own them as Truths. And thus much briefly of reasonable Arguments in behalf of Prouidence, to oppose that slight Plea of Atheistical Spirits already Proposed, and dissolued.

8. The third Proposition. As Atheists plead fallaciouly against Prouidence, so Heathens Iewes, and Hereticks follow closely the like Strain in euery Argument proposed against the Mysteries of Faith taught by Christ and his Church. I would say. As the Atheist run's headlong with his weak Iudgement vpon Difficulties, so these now named, erre as he erreth. They make *Direct Reason* to see more than it can see, to Comprehend Mysteries incomprehensible, and quite cast aside that Prudent reflex Reason, which allayes all, and giues most Satisfaction. For example, The Heathen Comprehend's not that great Mystery of the Trinity, and there stand's puzzled. Good cause, say I, for if à Cockle shell contain's not the whole Occan; why should thy shallow head comprehend the Trinity? Were this possible; either thou must be God, or God leaue of to be what he is. The Iew vnderstand's not how God became man, and dyed ignominiously vpon à Cross. Obserue à strange Stupidity saith Diuinely S. Chrisostom. *Lib. Quod Christus sit Deus*, towards the end. These Aduersaries of Christ read of contempt and Disgrace, and credit all. They read in the same Scripture of our Saviours *Admirable Miracles* and belieue nothing. Here is want

*Harsh sequels granted by Atheists.*

*Atheists and Heretiques argue à like.*



*The Affertion proved.*

of Reflex Reason. The Heretick boggles at the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, and wonders that a Church made up of fallible men can be held infallible. And from whence comes this boggling? What cause is there of wonder? He Answers. Transubstantiation seems contrary to Sense and Reason. Very good. I Ask again, to what Reason is it opposit? Grant *grati* the Utmost, it only seem's contrary to that not well-lighted Reason which more often beguils than learns vs Truth, or which loseth it self in the Search of deep Mysteries, where it can find no Exit. But Answer I beseech you? Is the Doctrine opposite to that Other wise Prudent iudgement, whereby all know or should know, *That reason is neuer more reasonable, than when it leaues off reasoning in high matters about reason?* No certainly For deny once this one clear Christian Principle, or say that's only belieuable and no more, which weak reason Approves, We destroy the very Essence of Faith and can believe nothing. The Doctrine of Gods *Free-acts*, of a Trinity, of the Incarnation, of Transubstantiation, and the other like Mysteries is quite renounced, if so much only gain's belief, as weak reason (puzzled in the Mysteries) see's Reason for.

*When Reason is reasonable*

*What effects weak reason produces.*

9. I say therefore. This Direct *purblind reason* cast's vs vpon Difficulties, *Reflex reason* solues them. The first makes vs meer Scepticks yea (and followed) Atheists too, The second good Christians: The First remains in darkness, the second finds light. The first would turn all faith into Science, the second faith, No, *si non credideritis non intelligatis*. Vnless you believe you shall not vnderstand. The first, though no more but a handmaid, would rule, bear sway, and command, the second curb's that petulancy, and bids Her Obey. Now the only difficulty is to show what is meant by Prudent-reflex Reason, and of what consequence it is in matters of Faith.

*How the reflex and prudent reason proceeds.*

10. Briefly this reason stands not long vpon the Mysteries reuealed but, leaues off that lost labour and relies wholly, on the Authority of one Master, that reueals them. Hence *Chas. Rom. in Recogn. D. Petri* gives this wise counsel. *Ante Omnia, &c.* Before

Before all things examin well by rational Motives, whether he be à Prophet that speaks; This done, ponder no more but believe boldly all he saith. And wonder nothing at the principle, for it is far more easy to find out the Prophet by his marks, and signes, than to vnderstand the sublime Doctrin he reaches. S. Irenæus! Lib. 9. C. 9. 1. speaks conformably. *Non enim nos aliter discere poteramus quæ sunt Dei, nisi Magister noster verbum existens homo factus fuisset.* We could not otherwise learn those Secrets God has revealed, vnles our great Master, the Diuine word, had been made man. Which is to say, the Reason we call reflex and prudent, most easily finds out the Master that teaches truth, and having once found him it relies on his word, whilst direct Reason staves intangled in difficult Mysteries, and learns nothing. Hence also it is, that S. Thomas and others most profoundly. Observe à notable difference, in our proceeding when we harken to God, and to man. When we treat with man, we rigidly examin the things he speak's, and if found absurd, or impossible, reject them; We observe the coherence of his Discourse, and judge whether it be consonant, or dissonant to reason. But to proceed thus with God, who can neither deceive, nor be deceived, is Impudence; Enquire then no more but thus much only, what God saies, and rest Satisfied, his own sole word, is warrant enough.

*What man  
speak's is to  
be exami-  
ned, what  
God saith,  
not.*

11. We come now to apply this Doctrin more home. The Primitive Christians, after à prudent search, found out by evident signes, and wonders, the great Master of the world Christ our Lord, and were commanded to hear him *Matth. 17. 9. Ipsum audite.* And because he proued Himself by manifest signes, to be à Doctor and Prophet sent from God, They believed the Doctrin he taught, *upon his own word*, though very sublime and about weak reason. Now here is à Point of consequence worth our serious ponderation.

12. Can any one imagin, that our great Doctor of truth left vs all comfortles, or so destitute in his Absence, without Pastors without Prophets, without liuing Oracles that yet speak

*An applica-  
tion of the  
Doctrin.*

*There is yet  
a teaching  
Oracle.*

in his name, and deliuer with all certainty those Verities he taught, and will haue euer taught? Reflect I beseech you. The great Master saith No. *Iohn. 20. 16. As my Father sent me, so I send you. Matih. 20. 19. Goe and teach all Nations. Luke. 10. 16. He that hear's you hears me.* And to these Pastors be promised *his presence and continual assistance to the end of Ages. Matt. 28. 20.* I will be with you euer to the end of the world. And the very excellency, the very nature, of Diuine Learning requires this Assistance, and must, if Diuine, depend on an Oracle which cannot but speak in Gods name Truth, and Truth only. For how is it possible to conceiue the vast moral Body of Christians, of so different tempers diffused the whole world ouer, knit firmly together in one sauing Faith, if no certain Oracle laies forth that learning, which God has reuealed, and will haue all to believe.

*The Plea of  
Sectaries  
reiected.*

13. The Sectary may Answer, Scripture is his Oracle, he needs no more. Contra. 1. Christianity had a liuing Oracle before Scripture was written, did then that Oracle cease to be because Gods truths were committed to paper or parchment? Contra 2. And mark I beseech you, how vnwarily weak reason (already reiected) works mischief to it self, and others. Reason reads Scripture, and when that is done, it sett's endles iarrs incomposible debates not only between man and man, but, which is worse, between God and man; Therefore Scripture thus handled can be no Oracle that vnites all in one Faith. These iarrs between man and man are manifest, for the Ariens, Pelagians, Protestants, and Catholicks read the book, and you see what fighting there is about the Sense, which only indeed (and not the bare letter) is Scripture. Now that some of these many Contend also with God, is vndeniable. For God approues not all these different senses because contradictory, Therefore some draw a false meaning from Scripture, and these *Some* (let the fault light yet where you will) oppose the true Sense of the Holy Ghost, yea act finally to their Eternal shame, against that noble perfection in God, the vndeceiued Verity and this I call contention or quarrelling with God

God (Truth it self) which as you see, our Sectaries will have you on without redress, because they allow of no Doctor no Teacher, no Oracle, that can end the Strife, or reduce the erring Party to due submission.

14. I say therefore, And here is my last Proposition. The Roman Catholick Church, which prudent reason easily find's out, and no other Society of Christians, is Gods own Oracle, What she teaches, we learn; what she reject's, we reiect, Her Definitive word is our warrant, without further dubious search made into the Mysteries proposed. The proof of my Assertion, depend's on this brief discourse.

*The true  
teaching  
Oracle  
name'd.*

15. God obliges all poor and rich, learned, and vnlearned, to embrace true Religion, And consequently afford's means to find it out, being a matter of so much weight as concerns Salvation, But the Necessary means to find true Religion, is to come to the knowledye of that Oracle which Proposes and teaches truth with all certainty, For no man teaches Himself but learns, if wise, of a better Master; Scripture you see Ends not our Controuersies. The Mysteries of Faith are not our Doctors, because these in themselves obscure, are belieued after Reason has found out Gods liuing Oracle, Therefore all Christians must own a Teacher, an Oracle of truth established by Almighty God, commissioned to enlighten and to instruct the world. *How shall they hear faith* S. Paul Rom. 10. 15. without a Teacher. Obserue well a teaching Oracle is to Propose Euangelical Doctrin. *But how shall they preach unless they be sent* Here you see the Mission and commission of Euangelical Doctors plainly pointed at. Now further. As none can but own such an Oracle, so all must likewise acknowlegde it so Visible by Marks and Signes, so obuious to sense and prudent reason, that the most simple may discern it from Heretical Communications; For this Oracle teaches the poorest sort of men, therefore Providence has made the euidence thereof plain, and suitable to the meanest capacities.

*The Church  
Commission'd  
to teach,  
instruct's  
all.*

16. Here we See again the difference, between the essential

Doctrin of the Church, and the Churches outward lustre manifested in Her Signes. The first is not got by long Pausing upon the Mysteries of Faith, nor by rigidly examining the things revealed, as we discuss Doctrins probable or improbable in Schools. No. The Christian saith not, I will either know how God can be one Essence and three distinct Persons, How the Incarnation is possible, or I will believe neither; For goe this way to work, he doth like one that takes wholsom Pills and chews them, but finding much bitterness, soon spits them out. Thus then he should proceed guided by a Reflex prudent discourse. My only search is to find out that Oracle whereby God speaks to Heathens, Jewes, Christians and Hereticks; There is such an one manifested, or none can Believe any thing. This once found, I examin no more, nor intricate my self in the Mysteries proposed, but will humbly Submit to all that's taught. This wisdom I learn from the Primitive Christians, who most easily knew that Christ our Lord was the true Messias, and one sent from God by the Wonders he wrought, though they little yet understood the depth of those Mysteries he deliuered, and obliged all to believe. Thus much Premised.

*How prudent reason  
discourses.*

17. I Proue that the Roman Catholick Church is Gods only Oracle. And first Her exteriour Marks and signs giue in as clear euidence of Her being the only Diuine Oracle, as the wonders which the Apostles wrought euenced them to be Diuine Oracles. With this lustre we haue a Church most visible, and discernable, from all vnorthodox Communities. None can Parallel Her in known Miracles, in Antiquity, Perpetuity, Conuerfions &c. 2. This Church hath taught the world euer since Christianity began, and no Orthodox Society but She only is nameable, which deliuered the Sincere Doctrin of Christ; For hint at any, they are manifestly proued condemned Hereticks. 3. She was neuer censured in any Age of error by so much as one confessed sound Christian, Nay I say more (and haue proued it aboue) She is so infallible, that if she erred but in one Article, She then ceased to be Gods Oracle. 4. This Church shows

*The Churches clear  
Euidence.*

shows the Mission of Her Pastors, and deriues Her Comission to teach the world, from God, and our Lord Iesus Christ.

18. The first Mission concerning the teaching of the new Testament Originally came from Almighty God, that sent his only Son our Saviour to preach. *John. 14. 24. The word you have heard is not mine but his that sent me, the Father.* *Luke 4. 14. He sent me to Evangelize to the poor.* Now Christ our Lord, sent the other Apostles. *Mark 16. 15. Going into the whole world preach the Gospel to all creatures.* These first Masters, had their Successors lawfully commissioned, they sent others age after age, in so much that the Mission of Orthodox Pastors legally authorized to administer Sacraments, and to preach Gods word, neuer yet failed in the Roman Catholick Church since Christ's being vpon earth, nor shall fail hereafter to the worlds end.

19. These Truths well weighed, And after many serious thoughts found as they are vndeniable, Prudent reason account's all that can be objected against our euenced Church, worse than folly. And here is the ground à *Priori* of the folly. These Aduersaries that Oppose vs, quite mistake the right way of Arguing, (were there any) For, whereas they should first find out Gods great Oracle which teaches truth, and obiect that against vs, They wholly waue this matter of highest Importance; And, so far as weak Reason can work, draw Arguments from the dark Mysteries of Faith. One finds difficulty in the Trinity and reiect's it, Another in the Doctrin of Transubstantiation and hold's it impossible. That is, weak reason, as much set's vp its own light against God, as if one should offer to extinguish the Sun beams by the dim light of à candle.

*Sectaries mistake the right way of arguing.*

20. Obserue I beseech you à strange Procedure. We euidence à Church; we proue Her Gods Oracle by the Characters, Signes and Marks manifestly laid open to all mens eyes, we say this manifested Oracle which has drawn Millions of souls to the Catholick belief cannot beguile vs. Our Aduersaries on the other side Say (notwithstanding this reasonable Euidence) God speaks not by Her, *Because the Mysteries are hard and abo-*

*ue*



*They plead  
most simply.*

ne Reason; whereas indeed the quite Contrary should be inferred, viz. Because they are mysterious God speaks by so evidenced an Oracle. And here is the Reason of my Inference.

*The reason  
of their  
weak plea-  
ding.*

21. Had the abstruse Mysteries taught by the Church been a humane Invention only, and not from God, the supposed Inventor of them (who euer he was) had been worse then mad to Propose so many, to our shallow Reason. He should rather have followed the strain of all other Hereticks, and with the Arians denied a Trinity, with Protestants cast of Transubstantiation, But this you see is not done, The Church speaks truth plainly, because She knows there is an other light, a stronger Evidence which lessens, facilitates, and conquer's these seeming Difficulties. If therefore there be evidence enough of Credibility for this one Proposition. *God speaks to all by this known Oracle*, Reason pleads no more, but yeilds to one that cannot erre.

*The Candor  
of the Evan-  
gelists writ-  
ting our Sa-  
uiours life.*

22. It may perhaps appear Strange, if One consider with what plain Simplicity the Holy Euangelists wrote the Gospel of Iesus Christ, where they seem to furnish the Iewes with Arguments against our Sauour. They declared how He was contemned, reproached, Scourged, haled from Tribunal to Tribunal, and finally Crucified. Here the Aduersaries of Christ Exclaim, and Ask what's more Difficult? Could God possibly (Say they) permit his only son to be thus abused, when 'tis writ, *Maledictus qui pendit in ligno*. Cursed is the man that hang's on a Cross? The Euangelists feared not the Obiection, but related the Story as it was. Nor did they to gain their great Master applause Couer or dissemble his Sufferings as Policy might haue done, had humane Wisdom only made the Book. No. They proceeded candidly, And why all this Sincerity think ye? The Answer is easy. They knew well, that the Victory which our Sauour gained after all these sufferings, The Renown he purchased vpon the Cross, the Miracles he then and formerly had wrought, were so forceable Euidences of his being the true Messias, that no contrary Humiliation, euen to death it self, could obscure that greater light and rational euidence of Truth. Therefo-

The whole Multitudes beholding the wonders at his sacred Passion after the Centurion had cryed out, *This man indeed was iust returned, knocking ther breasts.* Luke. 23. 48. And in his life time, said. *Quid facimus?* What do we doe? *This Christ* works so many wonders, That if we dismiss him, All will belieue in him.

*Arguments drawn from what is said. Reflections made vpon the premised Doctrin.*

23. Hence I Argue. If the euident Light of our Sauours glorious Miracles was sufficient to vanquish Incredulity, and to work a Belief in all of his truly being the Son of God, notwithstanding the difficulty of the Mystery; It followes clearly that the vndeniable Euidence of the Roman Catholick Church already laid forth, is as fully sufficient to vanquish the Incredulity of Heathens, Iewes and Hereticks, And to work this Perswasion in all (notwithstanding the high Mysteries proposed) that She is Gods Oracle. For here is my Principle, and most vndoubted. That as the Verity of Christian Religion is to be learned from that known Oracle which bears Christ's Ensigns, without disputing the Sublimity of the Doctrin, so the falsity of a Doctrin is proved, (Not by the difficulty thereof), but, is clearly gathered, from the Nullity of an vneuidenced Church, which teaches it. An vneuidenced Church therefore is no warrant of true Doctrin.

24. And here you haue briefly the fundamental Reason, why no Heretick, can probably oppose the receiued Doctrin of our Catholick Oracle, or defend his own contrary to it, whilst he is Churchless. I mean so long as he giues in no Euidence of an other Church distinct from the Roman Catholick, as Ancient, as vniuersal as She is, as glorious in Miracles as She is, as famous for Conversions as She is, as Vncensured as She is, as com-

*Christ, and His Church preuaile against Incredulity.*

*The true reason why no Heretick can oppose the Church.*

Bbb

millio-

missioned to preach, and teach the world, as She is, I say with  
no such qualified Church can be evidenced, which contradicted  
our present Catholick Doctrine, and maintained that of *Sectaries*,  
so long the Protestant cannot defend his own opinions, nor  
rationally oppose our Catholick Tenents. For here, as *S. Austin*  
anciently observed disputing with the Donatists, lies the main  
Business and it decides all Difficulties. *Virum vestra, an nostra sit*  
*Ecclesia Dei*. Whether yours, or ours, be the Church of God.  
Let then this one point, worthy Debate, be rigidly examined; And  
't is easily done may the ever acknowledged Marks, and Sig-  
nes, of the true Church have weight with Prudent reason, We are  
all without more Dispute reunited in one Ancient Faith.

*Sectaries*  
Ever decline  
the Sentence  
of an Evi-  
denced  
Church

*And trifle  
time away.*

24. And who can (if his cause be good) decline this modest  
Offer? When 't is known, that these publick Signs have first  
and established this publick Iudgement in all through the Chri-  
stian world. That a Church so vnderiably Ancient, so Miracu-  
lous, and drawing Souls to Her, cannot but be Gods Sacred O-  
racle? But *Sectaries* in all their Polemicks waue this worthy  
Question concerning an evidenced Church, and unworthily to  
the great Wearisomnes of every Reader, stand pitifully trifling  
with a few long since defeated and worn-out Controversies. I  
say trifling, For is it not more then slight and frivolous, now to  
flurt at the worshiping of Images, now to pelt the Pope, now to  
quote a half senced Sentence against Purgatory, now to mischiefe  
a Story, now if a wickednes lie in a Corner to rife that, Now to  
talk, as if men were mad, of the Roman Churches Idolatry.  
Here to iibe at our Ceremonies, there to attain the Spotes Re-  
putation of Christs Spouse? Say for Gods sake to what purpose  
is this? when the Knowledge of that *Vnum necessarium* which  
cannot but be known. viz. *Here is Gods evidenced Oracle* so  
clearly ends all Debates, so iustly determin's what's true, and  
what's false, in these and the like particulars, that none can, un-  
lesse led on with a Spirit of Contradiction withstand the iust Sen-  
tence of this One evidenced Oracle.

25. If the Sectary reply, notwithstanding the Churches Evi-  
dence

dence, many things She teaches appear doubtful to him. I have answered. *Disc. 1. C. 18.* Proofs only doubtful, yea though Probable also, (which is not) want pith to gainsay an Evidenc owned by the publick Wisdom of the Christian world: But the greatest Part of the Christian world Alwayes owned these Truths. First, That God has, and euer had, a Church Visible on earth. 2. That his Church may be known by Her Marks, Signes and Moti- ues, and that the most meet Signes to Distinguish Her by, are an- swerable to those, manifested in Christ our Lord. 3. That the Roman Catholick Church only, Evidently shewes these Signs, and by Virtue of them demonstrat's Her self to be Gods own Oracle. Here you haue my Principles already laid forth, And a Petition with them to Protestants, to infringe or weaken but One of them, vpon Scripture-Proof, vpon the irrefragable Te- stimony of Fathers, or by Virtue of any Principle which may appear probable to the vniuersal Sense, or rational Consent of such as haue been owned Orthodox since Christ liued on earth. But to do this is vtterly impossible.

26. Descend now if you please to particular Controuersies, you shall euer find that nothing but the twilight of weak Rea- son, meer Doubtfulness I mean, support's Protestant Religion. It is doubtful say these Aduersaries, whether Purgatory be, or no. It is doubtful whether Praying to Saints be Orthodox Doctrin. The Popes Supremacy ouer the whole Church is Doubtful, and Questionable. Very Good, let these Proposi- tions pass yet as doubtful. *Perhaps Purgatory is not, Perhaps it is. Perhaps inuocation of Saints is Orthodox Doctrin, Perhaps no,* For neither the one, nor other considered in Themsel- ues is a Truth Eident *Ex terminis*, or so much as Morally certain. Now here is the iust Trial. The Protestant positi- uely denies Purgatory. I positiuely Assert it. Both Propositions are hitherto supposed doubtful, Therefore He who maintains truth is obliged to raise his Proposition from that low State of a poor *Perhaps* or doubting, to a higher Degree of certainty. The

*Wh at the  
most ancient  
Christians  
owned,*

*Doubts and  
Cauals are  
the only  
Support of  
Protestancy.*

# 380 Disc. 2. C. 12. Fallacies of the Churches &c.

Catholick speaks plainly and Argues thus. Gods evidenced Oracle which beares the Marks, the Ensigns of Christ Iesus, and taught the world from the Beginning, obliges all as well to belieue à Purgatory, as à Trinity of Persons. I cannot therefore, Saith he, without à Forfeiture of all Reason and striving against the Publick wisdom of the Christian world, Own this, à faithful Oracle in the Proposal of the one Mystery, and hold it Perfidious or Traiterous in the other. Here is the Catholicks Evidence. Now Mark well. The proofs of the Protestants Proposition, (*There is no Purgatory*) are euer as remote from Certainty, as miserably dubious, as his very Assertion is. I say no Proof goes about the Strength of one poor deficient and Weak Perhaps. If he allege Fathers Contrary to Purgatory, or any other Catholick Tenet, His own reason yet in à cloud tells him. Perhaps, He hitt's on the true Sense, Perhaps not. If he plead by Scripture he neuer get's about the degree of doubting. If he take recourse to History or any other Principle what euer, He shal find himself at the end of his labour, where he was at the Beginning as doubtful in his Proofs as in his Assertion. And why? He hath no evidenced Church to rely on. But more of this hereafter. See also. Disc. 1. C. 11.

The Assertion declared and proved.

CHAP. XIII.

*Other Inferences drawn from the precedent Doctrin.  
Atheists and Hereticks Argue alike. The Moti-  
ues of Credibility lead to a total Belief of  
what euer the true Church Proposeth. A  
word of Mr Thorndicks Mistakes  
concerning the Church-*

1. **T**He first Inference. All that's pleadable in Behalf of Protestancy or any particular Tenet thereof, is not only doubtful but highly improbable, vpon These two Principles. First, that a Church evidenced by the very same Marks and Motiues which Christ our Lord Shewed to the world, reiect's the Nouelty, ( And no Authority on earth can Contest with an Oracle so clearly Manifest. ) The other Principle. No Society of Christians signalized with the like Motiues as the Roman Catholick Church Demonstrat's, euer maintained so much as one Tenet of the Protestants Doctrin. Here the ingenious Reader is desired to reflect a little how we proceed.

*Two Princi-  
ples.*

2. I proue my Catholick Doctrin by the Publick Authority of an evidenced Church; ( That's my Principle ) And our Adversaries to Oppose me come armed with two or three main'd dark Sentences, of the Holy Fathers and think this enough to cast Popery out of the world. No such Matter my good Countrymen, There is yet much more to do, before you speak probably. You explode *Transubstantiation*, *Purgatory*, *Inuocation of Saints*. We Ask whether you euer had a Church as Euidenced, as Ancient, as vniuersal, as Commissioned to teach as ours, which publickly maintained your Tenets and censured The Roman Catholick Doctrin? Show vs such a Church vpon solid Principles the work is done, you giue weight For weight, Euidence for Euidence, and may Speak boldly, Nay I say more, you may

*The Sella-  
ries opposi-  
tion against  
the Church  
is null.  
And why?*

Bbb 3

well.



well triumph, For vpon the Supposition, we are vanquished, But Fail to do this (and fail you must) you are silenced, yea, impossibilitated to write more Controuerxies. See more of this Subject aboue. Disc. 1. C. 19.

*The Atheists  
Way of ar-  
guing paral-  
l'd with  
that of So-  
briety,*

3. A second inference. The Atheist and Protestant plead alike. That is. As the one Argues against God, iust so the other doth against Christ's Church. All know the more ancient Atheists offer'd not positiuely to Demonstrate the Non-existence of God, for there is no Principle to ground that Senseless Assertion vpon, But chiefly excepted against the Proofs drawn from the visible works in Nature and thought these so weak to Euince à Deity, that there might well be none. Thus our Sectaries proceed. For stark shame they dare not deny à Church of Christ, Yet their whole labour is so to obscure Her Euidence, that no man can possibly find out the Oracle by *Signes, Miracles, Conuersions, and Antiquity*. Therefore as the Atheist in effect denies God, or at least stand's doubtfull of His Being, So the Sectary, to parallel him, because He denies the Churches glorious Euidence, cannot but remaine doubtful, whether there be any such Oracle or no. Again as the Atheist bewrayes his folly in giuing the Lie to the vniuersal Iudgement of mankind, when he Saies the works of Nature proue not à Deity, So the Sectary run's the same Carreer, betrayes his folly, and giues the Lie to the whole Christian world, when he saies, the Manifest works of Grace, visible in the Catholick Church conuince Her not to be God's Oracle.

*A Church  
clearly eu-  
denced can-  
not be ex-  
cepted  
against.*

4. A third inference. The sole Euidence of the Roman Catholick Chnrch visible by Her Marks, so clearly conuinces and carries on the whole Catholick Cause without exception, So utterly vanquishes the Protestants Plea of Errours entering into this great moral Body, that it is highly improbable, yea à flat Calumny to impeach Her of any. Here is my reason. Meer doubts, or crasy Topicks can not reuerse Euidence, But the Churches Antiquity, Her vast extent, Her Progress, Her Miracles, Her Conuersions and the other like Signes, are

is plain, sensibly and vnderstandably euident; Therefore all imploding Her of Errour is more than improbable, vnless She has erred in shewing such Marks as haue made the world Christian. Now further. If this Euidence stand's firm, Her Doctrin is made euidently Credible by it, that is, so worthy of Acceptance by diuine Faith; That Reason, after so much Light seen, is obliged vnder pain of damnation to yeild Assent to the Doctrin. For, as none can prudently belieue, before this Euidence be attained. (*Qui cito credit leui est corde, Eccles. 19. 44.* One too quick in belieuing is not wise) So none after it is had, can without damnable sin Disbelieue.

3. Hence I Argue. The Doctrin of the Primitiue Church was made euidently credible to reason (That is) worthy of all Acceptation in the three or four first Centuries; or was not; If not; none could then belieue, with diuine Faith; For the Euidence of credibility necessarily preceed's Faith, And as Faith in it self is strong, most certain, and victorious ouer Incredulity (*1. 5. 4. This is the victory which ouercom's the world, our Faith*), So this preuius Euidence, answerably brings Reason to so firm a State of belieuing certainly, that nothing Proposable can Eclipse that clear and manifest light.

4. Contrarywise, if those Primitiue Christians had the Euidence we speak of, and were thereby obliged to belieue, We Catholics are Most secure, for the very same Euidence still continues to this Age in the Roman Catholick Church. Miracles go on, Conversions of Nations go on, the Succession of Pastors goes on, The fulfilling of Prophecies goes on, Sanctity of life in Thousands and Thousands, is manifest to our eyes and senses. Every day the Church growes older, and which is enough to conuince the most obdurate Heretick, the louely vnion, the unanimous Consent, of so many Nations though different in tongues, in manners in Education, (conspiring, and openly Professing one and the same faith,) hath not only gained our Church a publick Reputation the whole world ouer, but more

*The Primitiue  
evidence  
of Credibility.*

*Is yet mani-  
fest in the  
Roman Ca-  
tholick  
Church.*

ouer

ouer proves this great Truth, That she, and none but she, is Gods Sacred Oracle.

*The force of  
the Inference.*

7. If then (and here lies the force of my Inference) it had been a flat calumny and more than vastly improbable, to have taxed the Apostolical Primitiue Church of Ertour after so great Euidence laid forth to Reason in Her Marks and Signs, it is no less sinful in the Protestant now, no less vngodly at this day, to accuse the present Church of corrupted Doctrin, whilst She frees her self from the Calumny, by giuing in the very same Euidence of Credibility. For here is my irrefragable Principle. The like full euidence of motiues lead's reason to draw Thence a most firm and certain Faith. Destroy this Euidence in any, that proues Himself to be Gods Oracle, you must deny it to Christ our Lord when he preached, To the Primitiue Church also, and finally to the Modern Catholick Church. Do so, All Faith perishes; Grant it to both the Ancient Church and this now in being, All pleading against our Catholick Doctrin is meer Vanity.

*An Obiection Proposed.*

8. The Sectary may reply. Though the Euidence we insist on hath some weight. Yet it followes not, that all the Doctrin our Church teaches is made evidently Credible, For he can easily except against the Doctrin, relying vpon other solid Grounds, and most approued Principles. Scripture, for example, the Authority of holy Fathers, the Records of Antiquity, the Form of the Primitiue Church, are his Principle, and by these he hopes to proue our Churches Doctrin False, which done the Euidence we build vpon, signifies nothing.

9. I am very willing to solue this Obiection, the Answer I hope, will show vpon what vnsteedy foundations Protestancy stands. To proceed with all clarity. This is Questionable, whether we, or Protestants, teach the Doctrin of Iesus Christ. And because it is here impossible to descend to all particular controuersies, we will fall vpon one only much debated (one serues for all). Viz whether Transubstantiation, or no Transubstantiation, be Orthodox Doctrin. The truth yet lies in darkness, there is no self-evidence either in the Affirmatiue or Negatiue, 'Tis yet no more but doubt-

doubtful, or a meer Perhaps, whether the Protestants or we  
 know Truth; Gods revelation which only can giue certainty is  
 yet obscure to vs both, and as little euidenth it Self, as the Ve-  
 ry we enquire after. By what means then can we raise our selues  
 about this state of Doubting to so great a degree of certainty, as to  
 say without fear. *Transubstantiation is Orthodox Doctrin.* And the  
 contrary, is not so.

10. The Catholick (to waue in this place other proofs) recur's  
 to his Church, And saith this Publick euident Oracle, as well  
 as him to a State of certainty for his Tenet, as the euident  
 Primative Church rais'd the first believing Christians from their  
 doubts to Security. For the like full euidence alwayes lead's to  
 a like certainty of Belief. The Protestant, hauing reiected our  
 present euident Church, hopes well, and will needs find  
 trues and falsity too in Her Doctrin, not by confronting Her  
 Euidence, or denoting an other Church, As ample, as ancient,  
 as miraculous, as She is, which held his Doctrin, for this,  
 though it should be pleaded, (if we come to a clear Decision,) is  
 unpleadable, becaus the Protestant has no such Oracle. What's  
 done therefore? I'll tell you, and you may iustly wonder. He  
 shaks of this clear Principle of an euident Church and pretend's,  
 (though there is no such matter) to launch into the vast Ocean  
 of *Scripture, Councils, volumes of Fathers, ancient Records* and thinks  
 to carry on his cause this way. Here He pick's vp one dark Senten-  
 ce of a Father, and triumph's with that, There on another. He-  
 re vpon the least hint giuen he Snarles at one piece of Popery,  
 there at another. Here he guesses, and there he misses. In a  
 word the man is busily idle, doth much, and iust nothing, run's  
 on, but is out of his way, utterly lost, without the guidance of  
 Gods euident Oracle which only can draw him out of the La-  
 byrinth. And if you Ask, why he is out? I Answer his Errour  
 lies here, that both in this and all other Controuersies, he makes  
 his false Suppositions to pass for proofs against euidence.

11. You shall see what I here Assert Made Good. To proue  
 no Transubstantiation the Sectary read's Scripture, Fathers, An-  
 tiquity,

Ccc

*Where the  
 difficulty  
 lieth*

*How the  
 Catholick  
 Proceed's.*

*The Sectary  
 takes a  
 Contrary  
 Way.*

equity, or what els you will. Be it so. He read's but not alone. For the learned Catholick bear's him companie and read's also. Mark now. The One after his reading glosses, so doth the other. The One compares Passage with Passage, so doth the other. The One discourses, So doth the other. But when all is done (and here lies the mischief) the Protestant imposes one sense vpon the perused Testimonies, and the Catholick another quite contrary. This dayly Experience teaches. viz. That we differ not so much about the words we read as about the sense of Scripture and Fathers. Therefore this also is Evident, That the Protestant aduances not his Doctrin (if yet he get so high) above the degree of guesing only, whilst he pleads by his glossed Scripture, and Fathers, For as long as the Catholick, wholly as learned and conscientious as He is, and an ample Church besides, opposes his far-fetch'd Sense out of the Fathers, He cannot without Impudency, and making a false Supposition to pass for his Proof, cry it vp as certain: Now further. As the sense he draws from Scripture and the Fathers is no more, but at most doubtful, (I say improbable) so his Assertion concerning no Transubstantiation, or what euer els he holds contrary to the Roman Catholick faith, is wholly as much wauering, or purely doubtful: But that which is only doubtful and no more is too weak, either to ground any Christian Tenet vpon, or to Contrast with the Roman Catholick Church, whose Doctrin is indisputably made evidently credible. Therefore unless a weake Vncertainty can reuerse Euident Credibility, the Sectaries Plea against the Church, is not only improbable, but highly improbable.

12. To conclude this Point. Here is an answerable Dilemma. It is possible to Denote, and point at another Church (which without dispute taught Protestant Doctrin and opposed ours) as Ancient, as large, and euery way as Euidenced to sense and reason, as the Roman Catholick Church is, Or it is not possible. If possible, controuersies are strangely ended, for prove me once such a Church, I say plainly. There is no such thing as true Faith in the world worthy defense. Why? Because if the Supposition

Which lea-  
ues him in  
State of  
doubting.

Wherever is  
doubtful  
ground is not  
Faith.

A Dilemma.

possession hold's two different Churches evidenced à like, equally as ancient, as efficacious in Doctrin and glorious in Miracles, clash with one another, *Say and Vnsay, approve, and condemn.* The one condemn's Protestancy, The other Popery, One will haue Transubstantiation belieued, The other not, which is as wholly destructive of Christian Faith, as if Scripture it self should plainly Speak Contradictions.

13. On the other side, If the Sectary can neither name, nor point at à Chutch (euery way as evidenced as the Roman Catholick) which expressly propugned Protestancy and opposed Popery, He shall neuer utter probable word against any one Article of our Catholick Faith; For throw an *evidenced Protestant Church* out of the world, All that is allegable in behalfe of its Doctrin, or against it, will either End, in à slight discharge, of à few scattered vnweighed Sentences of holy Fathers (no sooner read than Answered) or, as we dayly Experience, in gross Mistakes, and bold Calumnies laid on our Doctrin. And can these think ye extinguish the visible Lustre of our Church, can these lessen the euident Credibility of Her Doctrin, or bring so known and owned an Oracle into open disgrace, or publick Disreputation? It is impossible. The most vigorous Abbetors of Protestancy may not only blush to Assert it, but will be baffled did we once liue to see the happy day, when our iust cause might be proposed, and heard in à Publick Dispute, before Learned and impartial Iudges.

*No evidenced Protestant Church, no pleading for Protestancy.*

*A VWord of Mr Thorndiks Mistakes discovered in His Book of Forbearance.*

14. Though I Honour Mr Thorndick, and hold him much more wise, Learned, and moderate, then some late voluminous Writers haue been, yet because Truth will out, I must not dissemble but Speak truth, And therefore Say in à word. *His whole attempt against the Roman Catholick Church is weak,* And the feebleness



of it Cannot but appear to every Reader that penetrates the force of the Principles already established. My wish indeed was to have Understood his meaning better in some particular passages, For here and there, he seem's to me à little obscure, yea, to build with one hand and to Pull down with the other, How euer by what is clear we haue enough, and may well refute his Errours.

15. Page 19. In the Book now cited He takes leave to blame all those who declare in behalf of the Protestant Church, that it depart's, or Separat's from the Church of Rome. For, *Saith he, seeing it hath bin granted in, and by this Church, ever since the Reformation that there is, and alwayes was saluation to be had in the Church of Rome as à true Church, though corrupted; I am very confident, that no Church can Separate from the Church of Rome, but they must make themselves thereby Schismaticks before God.* I grant. 1. Such are Schismaticks as leaue this Church, I grant 2. Saluation was, and will euer be had in this Church, Yet say. 3. It is Calumny, yea à plain Contradiction, to grant Saluation attainable in this Church, and to impeach Her of Errour or corrupted Doctrin. The Calumny is vnquestionable because the Marks, the signes and exterior Euidence of our Church already insisted on, either prove her Gods Oracle as sound and faithful in all She teaches as the Primitive Church was, or conuince nothing. What then can these Aduersaries ayme at? Will they grant Her no less illustrious in Marks and Motiues which induce to faith than the Apostolical Church was, and yet make Her à Monster, à harlot, and perfidiously false in proposing Faith? Have so many learned Doctors Age after Age taught Her Doctrin, so many Martyrs shed their blood In defense of it, so many Saints wrought glorious Miracles to confirm it, and after all can it vpon no proof but vpon à vain and most vniust Supposition be called false and vnorthodox? Nothing can be more extrauagant. You must therefore either deny the Euidence we plead by, (which is vdeniable) or own this Church entirely sound in euery Doctrin proposed, as Faith. Whence it is that when Iewes, Gentils, and Hereticks, conuert themselves to Catholick Religion

*Church  
Motiues; ei-  
ther prove  
that Oracle  
pure in all  
She teaches,  
or in No-  
thing.*

Religion drawn thervnto by the light of evident Motives, they frankly believe no Part, but all Church Doctrin without Exception. And the Reason of believing thus *Wholly* and not by halves, is given aboue. C. 5. 6. where we Demonstrate, that if the Roman Catholick Church has erred in the proposall but of one Point of Faith, and obliged Christians to believe that under pain of Damnation, She is not only traiterous to Christ, and therefore can be believed in nothing, But moreouer at this present day there is no true Faith professed in the Christian world. Contrarywise, if She be true and vnerrable in all teaches, She is to be believed in every Article without reserue.

*The Reason  
of believing  
entirely, and  
not by halves*

16. Now to the double Contradiction in the words alleged. It is granted Saith. Mr. Thorndicke *that there is, and alwayes* *an* *saluation* *to be had in the Church of Rome as a true Church,* *though corrupted.* I Answer this is implicative. For if true, She is not corrupted in Doctrin; or if corrupted in Doctrin She is not true; Vnless one makes by meer fancy a Chimera of the Catholick Church, and sayes a true Church may be corrupted which is impossible (for truth excludes corruption) Therefore no Orthodox Christian euer owned a Church partly true, partly false. You Sr, say. 2. *Saluation may be had in this Church.* Very good. Ergo Her Faith is sound able to produce in every soul Repentance, the loue and fear of God, and what more is necessary to acquire Heauen, Or if it want this Essential Perfection and bring not men to a security of Saluation, it is no Faith at all, and consequently Catholicks must be damned for want of diuine Faith, hauing no true Church to believe in. See more. Disc. 1. C. 21. n. 7. Finally, whereas you Assert. *No Church can Separate from the Church of Rome, but they must make themselves thereby Schismatics before God.* The Inference Sr, is true, but most clear against your Selfe, And proues that both you and the Protestant Party are Schismatics before God and man too. For this matter of Fact, Viz. That you Separated from, and rebelled against the Roman Catholick Church is as euident, as That England, once Catholick, communicated with Rome in

*The Contra-  
diction euin-  
ced against  
this Author.*

*Protestants  
proued Schis-  
matics.*

Points of Faith, in the use of Rites, Liturgies, Sacraments, And afterward diuorced it self from that Communion. Reply, we tell vs you had cause to do so, and so far only receded from this Church, as She receded from Her Ancient purity, You make again à false Supposition your Proof, your self Iudge in à cause you haue nothing to doe with, And the louely Spouse of Christ loyal and perfidious, Chast and à harlot with one breath.

*One clear  
Inference  
against Mr  
Thorndick.*

17. Yet one word more. You say the Church of Rome is à true Church wherein Saluation is had, *though corrupted.* Hence I Argue; Either you in England are now at this instant separated from this Church, *as it is True, or not;* If separated from it, *as true*, the Reformation belongs to you only, you are to cancel your own Errours, according to the form of Doctrin in our Church, *for she, if true*, is so far pure that she cannot be reformed. And thus much you seem to graunt P. 33. *It is out of loue to the Reformation, that I insist vpon such à Principle as may serue to re-vnite vs with the Church of Rome; being Well assured, that we can neuer be Well reunited, without seluing otherwise.* That not only the Reformation, but the common Christianity must needs be lost in the Diuisions, *which which will neuer haue an end otherwise.* What is this to say, but to wish the English Church reformed by the Roman Catholick? Therefore something (if these quoted words bear sense) is amiss, not in the Roman, but in the English Church, which needs Reformation. Now on the other side, if you say the Roman Catholick was and is à true Church, and that the English also is altogether as true as she, or hath not separated from the Roman in matter of *true Doctrin*; it followes ineuitably, if the Supposition hold's, that neither of them needs Reformation in matter of Truth (for here we speak not of Rites and Ceremonies which are alterable.) To what purpose then is it to talk of reforming either Church, in point of Truth, when both are Supposed so true, that neither can be reformed, nor differ, if true in faith, from one another?

*Another In-  
ference as  
clear.*

18. Perhaps you may (yea and must) reply, if your Discourse  
haue

have sense. Though they are true in Doctrins called fundamental, yet both haue their lesser corruptions, and these need Reformation. This is all that can be Asserted, For if both are false in fundamentals neither of them at this day is the Orthodox Church of Christ, and consequently both the Romanists and English wanting fundamentals, are People essentially Churchless. Now vpon the Supposition of lesser corruptions only not fundamental, you haue a dreadful Inference against Protestants, And as true, as dreadful. Viz. That their first Separation from the Roman Catholick Church was damnably Sinful, though She were here falsely supposed to haue erred in smaller matters; This, I say followes, not only because the Ancient Fathers expressly teach, No Reformation can be of such Importance, as to counteruaile the danger of Diuisions, And that all things should be rather tolerated than to consent to Schism in the Church; But vpon this other account also, that the Revolt of Protestants from our Ancient Church hath laid such a visible disgrace vpon a noble Kingdom, That none but the powerful hand of God, with the wisdom of our Gracious Souereign and the States concurrence, can take it of. The Nation, we see with our eyes, is strangely divided, hideously discomposed, Religion is of the hinges, and men generally are so transported into Extranagancies; that none can say what the Religion is which England Professes at this day, There are so many Sects, so many Diuisions, so many Tub-Preachers, so many woemen-Gospellers, so many Quakers, so many Fanaticks, so many Leviathan-Monsters, that you may read and see without turning to the Bible, a Babylonian Confusion, amongst them. Would Popery, Sr. think ye, (you are all vnderstand moderate, and learned) had that continued, laid England vnder such a publick Disgrace as this Rabble of men, and Fanaticks haue done? Let the world iudge.

19. Now if you Ask, from whence came this fearful Disorder, which to my sorrow makes our Country ridiculous to forrain Nations? I answer. The first Rent, the first Rupture, the first Schism of Protestants from the Catholick Church, occasioned

all.

*A third Inference.*

*Touching upon the deplorable Disensions in England.*

*The Origin  
of all these  
lamentable  
Divisions.*

*The Fana-  
ticks Argu-  
ment against  
Protestants.*

*All sectanes  
will reform,  
and none can  
do it.*

*The Church  
which re-  
form's other  
erring So-  
cieties must  
not need any  
reformation.*

all. Here is the Source, and Sole Origin of these unfortunate Revolutions. Wherefore this Argument proposed by a Fanatick against Protestants is vnanswerably conuincing, *Ad hominem*, I say *ad hominem*; not that I approue Fanaticism). As ye Protestants without recourse to any other iudge but your Selues vpon your own Authority quitted the Roman Catholick Church, and thought your Fact reasonable; So we Fanaticks, without recourse to any but our own tender Consciences, (knowing you began a Reformation not yet compleat) leaue Protestantism, And hold our fact as reasonable as yours: And thus others by your first Example may reform Religion to the worlds end. Yet all of vs (say these men Say) make but one true Church, For if Mr. Thorndicke Page. 9. Answer's pertinently to that demand. Where his Church was before Luther. *There it was, saith he, where it is. The same Church reformed, which was depraued afore.* If this Answer I say be good, Pray you why should Fanaticks, Nay why ought the Arians, and worst of Heretickes be excluded from being of one and the same Catholick Church? For the Church seem'd to Sectaries an ample field, and embraceth all called Christians though differently reformed. The only difficulty then is, to find out him, or se Those, who among so many dissenting Reformers (the whole world ouer) haue happily made the best choice, in mending Religion. The Protestant you see reform's the Catholick, the Puritan, the Protestant, and the Quaker will reform all at once, vntil some new Sectary peep out, that bring's in a better Fashion. And is it possible, shall all these vnreformed People reform one another? This difficulty cannot be solut in Protestant principles.

20. I say in a word. It is impossible to reform any erring Society of Christians, but by the *Rule Doctrin* and Authority, of some one Church, which must be owned so pure, that She cannot be reformed in what She teaches. The reason is clear. For a fallible and deformed Church, can no more help to reform another like wise fallible or unreformed, than the blind lead the blind. Hence methinks Mr. Thorndicke, who hold's Protestantism

is fallible; and as much out of order as Popery, Speak's little to the purpose Page. 11. where he saith. *There is no Power in this Church and Kingdom (he mean's England) to reform it self in matter of Religion, but only by that Form, and to that Form which may appear to have been held by the whole Primitiue Church before the Corruption came in, which we pretend to reform.* I cannot but smile at this word *appear*. Pray you Sr, Say to whom must it *Appear*? What? To you or me, or to any priuate fallible man? You talk as if, for both, the Primitiue Doctrin were so apparently Manifest to People, that euery one by opening Books and reading Authority, may with a wet finger clearly discouer the true and Orthodox Form of Religion, Whereas the contrary is euident, For haue not we and Protestants (to omit others) now for a whole Age perused Councils, and Fathers, and after all, do we not see with our eyes, that what seem's Orthodox Doctrin to one Party, seem's not so to the other? It appears manifestly to me, that the Primitiue Fathers, so openly maintained an vnbloody Sacrifice vpon the Altar, that the wit of man cannot without violence, wrest them to a contrary sense; doth the Truth appear so to Protestants? It appeared to S. Cyprian *Epist. 55. ad Cornel.* and to me also, That Heresy and Schism, take their Origen from this, *That the fraternity of Christians answerably to Gods command, Obey not one Priest (and one Iudge) who is Christs Vice-gerent in the Militant Church on earth.* Will Sectaries read and vnderstand this as I doe? It seemed clear to S. Hierome cited above, That one out of the Roman Catholick Church, wherof Pope Damasus was then Head really belonged not to Christ, but to Antichrist, and Therefore ought to be esteemed an Alien from the house of God; a Iesumitan, and prophane. Will the Protestant after his reading these words own the Doctrin pure and Orthodox? No he dares not.

31. What then is the Result, though we read these and a hundred other Passages in the ancient Records so Plain for Popery? Experience tell's vs, nothing els ensues but an endles contest about their Sense, and crossing one an other with contrary glosses.

D d d

This

*Disensions  
arises after  
the perusal  
of the primi-  
tine writings*



*The plainest  
Authorities  
Convince  
not Sectaries*

*what is re-  
quired  
of Mr  
Thorndick*

*A New Re-  
former of  
Religion in  
these old  
days of the  
world.*

*would  
appear ridi-  
culous to all.*

This is all that can appear to Mr Thorndick. Wherefore Vain Recourse be had to better Principles then to meer Appearances, Disputes may goe on till Dooms day, without Satisfaction, or fruit to any. Be it how you will. My hearty wish is, that Mr Thorndick, who hitherto Stays in Generalities, would please fully to set down that whole Plat-form of Religion, which he conceives exact, and suitable to the Primitive Church. Were this done (which will neuer be) I am confident, His Extract or Draught would appear so imperfect, and mishapen à Business in the iudgement of Catholicks and Protestants also, That as the one Party cannot, but look on it with disdain, so the other would reiect it as unworthy Acceptance.

22. Besides, would it not seem à new wonder to Strangers abroad, Yea and as ridiculous as wonderful, were they told, that after so much labour spent about reforming Religion in England, we have yet at present à thoughtful Gentleman there, that's very busy in Setting forth the last and best Edition of *Protestancy Reformed*, which perhaps may proue worse than any other govt before. Naught it must needs be, for this Reason, That the means he would reform by, has no Proportion with the designed End. For by the light of à few dead Manuscripts, written 14. 17. 18. yrs Since, He offer's now to amend all the Churches in the world, though the very sense of these Writings which must be the Rule of his Reformation, is neither well known to Himselfe, nor yet agreed on, by those dissenting Churches he would reform. What think ye? Were this sense yet to be learned, (the want whereof causes endles Errours among Sectaries,) would not common Prudence rather take it from à liuing Oracle, which has taught the world time out of mind, than from à late Nouellist that Professes himself fallible, and Therefore may most easily Misinterpret the best Records? This liuing Oracle at least promises infallibility (Which Shall be proued presently) And therefore is à Sure Principle to rely on, Then The Fathers Sentences long Since Written, whilst Sectaries make Their sense and true meaning à Matter of Contest.

23. Yet one word more and I end. Mr Thorndick will Re-  
form the present Roman Church Corrupted, by the Primitive  
supposed pure for the first 4. or. 5. Ages. I must needs de-  
mand first, whether that Primitive Church, the Rule of his Re-  
formation was infallible, and pure in those pretended fundamen-  
tals only, necessary to Salvation, though not in other Doctrins of  
lesser Moment? Or. 2. Whether She (because fallible) as much  
needed Reformation in smaller Matters not called fundamental,  
as this present Church is supposed to need? Or. 3. Whether  
She was so entirely pure in every doctrine, little, and great, that  
She could not be brought to more Purity, or be better Reformed?  
Grant the first. viz. That the Primitive Church was vnerrable  
and pure in fundamentals only, not in others, The present Ro-  
man Church is as good as She was, For our Adversary own's  
Her a true Church wherein Salvation may be had, and thus far  
She needs no reforming. Grant. 2. that both these Churches,  
because fallible, might erre, and perhaps have err'd in lesser Mat-  
ters, not named fundamental, The Primitive can be no Rule of  
Reformation to the present Church, because that Primitive is alike  
errable, alike reformatable, And for ought men know, as much out  
of the way of truth in Non-fundamentals as the present Church  
is, Therefore I said above, if the blind cannot lead the blind, a  
Church wanting Reformation cannot reform another sick of the  
same malady.

24. If finally it be Said, the Primitive Church was so infal-  
lible, so pure every way, both in great and little Matters, that  
She could not be more reformed in the first 5. Centuries for exam-  
ple: We have a Church once entirely pure, And then urge our  
Adversary not barely to say it, But to prove upon indubitable  
Principles, Scriptures, Fathers, or the General Consent of Christians,  
that She continued not wholly as pure in the sixth, seventh, or  
eighth Age, and so downward to our dayes as She was before.  
To shew a Deficiency in this Church once confessedly true, in  
after Ages, will be more than an Herculean labour, when it is  
demonstratively evidenced above, That nothing but a Church

D d a

equally

*Questions  
proposed to  
our Adversary.*

*Herein Sa-  
tisfaction is  
most requi-  
red.*

*A supposition  
made &  
Proof.*

equally as Ancient, as Vniuersal, and glorious in Murder as the Roman is, can probably impeach Her of the least Corruption. Mr Thorndicks Mistake is, that he makes (as Sectaries vually do) a false Supposition his Proof; He supposes our Church corrupted in Doctrin, and then will amend it according to his fancy by the Primitiue, whereas he knowes, or ought to know, that we Catholicks deny His Supposition, and say both are vnerable, and withall Assert, that no Authority on earth can better inform vs of the Primitiue Doctrin than the present Roman Church, which hath successiueley handed it to vs Age after Age. Howeuery to take away all ambiguity and further Dispute in this Matter, you haue next, three following Chapters which I hope will giue Satisfaction to the rational Reader. More shall be added hereafter.

## CHAP. XIV.

*Whether there be a Church of one Denomination infallible, not only in Matters miscalled Fundamental, but in all and euery Doctrin She Proposes, and Obliges Christians to belieue, as Faith?*

*what we  
intend to  
prove.*

1. **A**S the Answer to the Question aym's at a clear and easy way of ending Controuersies Concerning Religion, So the following Discourse tend's to settle one great truth in the minds of euery one. viz. That both the Ancient, and present Roman Catholick Church is not only infallible, But that the Aduersaries of Her infallibility destroy the very Essence of Christian Religion, And deseruedly merit vpon that Account, The name of Schismaticks and Heretiques also.

2. To

To make good what's now Asserted, a few *Postulata* or Principles must be premised. One is, That Church which Promises, and proves Herselfe infallible in Doctrine doth not only facilitate, but gives also absolute Security to Faith, For such a Church Participat's most, and comes neereſt to that first Divine Apostolical Spirit, which confessedly was infallible.

*Upon these following Principles,*

1. A. 1. Principle. Whereas nothing hath, or ought to have, a stronger Influence over the minds of men than Religion, So nothing can discountenance it more, than a steadfast Persuasion of its Fallibility, and Consequently, of it's easily being False. This Persuasion Cut's of all Christian Assurance, and drives men to so cold an Indifference of embracing this or that Religion, That it much import's not which to take to, any or none.

2. A. 3. Principle. The means or influence whereby Christ preserves his Church infallible, needs not to be explicated by any Supernatural quality, personally inhering in the *Teaching Representation*, or intrinsically elevating the convened Prelates to a State of Infallibility; for t's enough, that the safe Conduct of Almighty God, who is alwaies vigilant, and Assists by his exterior Protection, so secures the Church from error, that She neither can be misled, when she teaches, nor mislead others. Yet I deny not but that an interior Motion of Grace may be, yea and often is in the hearts of such as are Assembled together in God's name, and Assisted to define infallibly. Divine Faith, Tis true actually elicited, even after the permanent Habit infused, requires a Supernatural Motion of Grace, But hereof we speak not at present.

*What the Churches Infallibility requires.*

3. A. 4. Principle. When it is enquired Whether the Church Diffusive be infallible, the Querie is not, whether the Motives inducing to distinguish that Oracle from others, Demonstratively and with all Metaphysical certitude, evidence likewise Gods Revelation relating to the Mysteries Believed; For this might lead vs to enquire whether Faith be evident in *Assensus*, That is, so Vnexceptionably manifest, that all may clearly

398 Disc. 2. C. 14. *There is a Church of one*

ly Infer from the Revelation clearly known, That the Mysteries believed, are evidently true. We now meddle not with that Difficulty, though great Divines patronize the Affirmative, but only Ask, Whether the Doctrine of Christ's Church be so infallibly Certain, that it cannot be False or deceive any. Catholicks own a triple infallibility necessary to Faith. The first proper to God's Revelation, no Protestant denies that. The second belongs to the Church, either *Diffusive*, or *Representative* in General Councils, whereby we learn, and that infallibly, those Truths which God reveales. The third infallible Assurance necessary to Faith, all Orthodox Christians have, that believeth the Mysteries revealed upon the Divine Testimony, Proposed by Christ's Church.

*The Question stated.*

*A threefold Infallibility.*

6. A. 5. Principle. If, (what is most undoubted) Divine Faith essentially relies upon Gods infallible Verity speaking by one or more men sent to Teach, (who prove their Mission and Demonstrate the Credibility of the Doctrine delivered) it necessarily follows, That, that first infallible Verity begets in every true Believer, no less perfect Faith Than what is most certain and infallible. Wherefore as it is the indispensable Duty of every believing Christian to acquiesce in, and rest upon God's infallible Veracity; So it is an indispensable Promise, That we have Christ present with a Church which teaches all Truth, And therefore cannot but Propose the Object of Faith infallibly. The same Promise irrevocably issued from Power and Goodness it self. Matt. 28. 20. *I am with you alwayes to the end of the world.* John 14. 16. *I will Ask the Father, and he will give you an other Comforter, the Spirit of truth to remain with you for ever. Hell gates cannot prevail against the Church.* Thus much premised.

*Mans Duty grounded on Christ's Promise.*

7. The Difficulty now agitated is. Whether the Roman Catholick Church and Her approved General Councils be so secured from Errour, That She cannot swerve from that first Support of Truth, (I mean God's infinite Veracity) But must when She teaches, Teach that exactly which God hath revealed, and will have after a sufficient Proposal, Universally believed. *scilicet*

She may, Yea actually has severed from God's Reue-  
lacion, and in great Matters too, though not perhaps in the  
primary Fundamentals, (as they are Called) or in Fundamentals  
thoroughly necessary to Saluation, And they were forced to this wicked  
Doctrin vpon three naughty Motiues.

What Pro-  
testants as-  
sert.

1. First to giue Scope, or rather to inuite Libertins to hold  
or deny so much of Christian Religion as pleaseth their fancy;  
And do we not see the liberty effectually laid hold on in En-  
gland amongst Phanaticks, and such giddy People? All this gid-  
diness came first from the reformed, or rather the deformed Nouelty  
of Protestancy. They do it. 2. to make Controuerfies Endles,  
For deny the Churches Infallibility, Cauils go on; Grant  
Her infallible Disputes are ended. 3. This is done, to quit  
themselues of an Infamy iustly laid vpon them, of being both  
Schismatics and Heretiques at once, which shall neuer be claw'd  
off, do what they can. For these vnfound reasons, or pestilent  
Motiues rather, The Church forsooth must needs be fallible.  
Catholicks on the other side, maintain the contrary, And say  
there is a Church so Infallible, that She cannot err in any thing  
She teaches, as Faith. And thus much God willing shall be  
conceded in the following Discourse. But to do it exactly, I am  
briefly to lay open to all that haue eyes, The Abiect, the Despe-  
rate and Desolate condition of a fallible Church. You haue  
here my first Proposition.

And why?

The Catho-  
lick Asser-  
tion.

9. A fallible Church is essentially Constituted, in a State of publick  
Rebellion and Hostility with it Self, Wages War against Infidels without  
hope of conuincing, or conquering any: And therefore cannot be Christ's  
Orthodox Church. To declare further what I would say know  
first, That Sectaries own a Catholick Church much larger than  
the Roman Catholick, And make Themselues Part of it. Con-  
ceded now (which though very hard is yet possible), that the  
Representatiues of this great Moral Body meet's in a General Co-  
uncil, and discusses the Question now in hand. Viz. Whether  
there is a Church of one Denomination Preserued infallible by Diuine  
Assi-

A fallible  
Church is  
in a State  
of rebellion.



*No means to unite it.* Assistance? Part of the Representative, and these are Protestants Oppose the total Infallibility of every Church. Part (Catholics I mean) Say one Church is infallible, and that is the Roman. The Difficulty proposed can be decided, or not. If not, This great Representative meet's to no purpose, but only to make more Strife in the world. If it can be decided, God has provided means whereby the truth of so weighty a Matter may be known, But there is no such means left, vnless some one Church or other (or all together) be owned infallible, Therefore an endless Hostility goes on, in this supposed Representative.

*Without some One Church be Infallible.* 10. That all means fail may Sectaries Votes haue place, is indisputably Eident. You shall see it clearly. The Catholick Party Appeals to Scripture, alleges these and other like Passages. *He who hear's you hears me*, and from thence infer's, Who euer hear's the Church hear's Christ, an Infallible Teacher. *The Church is the Pillar and ground of Faith*, and hence concludes, She is infallible. *The Spirit of Truth shall remain with the Church for euer.* Pastors, and Doctors, are appointed by Providence to proue the faithful from *Wauering in Faith*, and all erroneous Circumstances. *Hell gates cannot preuail against the Church &c.* What can be more Significant, if plain words haue sense for the Infallibility of some One Church? Yet all these and many other Testimonies shrink to nothing, (may Sectaries Glosses stand in force) That no man can say what God speak's in these Scriptures or know the Truth now debated. Viz. *Whether any Church be infallible or no*, This means failing of its End which ought to compose our Strife, Hostility is as vigorous, as when the Dispute began, for yet we know nothing certainly.

*And Fathers Speak significantly the Churches Infallibility,* 11. Passe from Scripture to Fathers, We haue there most pregnant Expressions. *The Church cannot be adulterated.* Cyprian *de Unit Eccle: VVhat She once receiued from Christ, She can hold Idem.* Epist. ad Corne. *She is a pure Virgin in Faith*, and cannot be deceived or seduced, nor overcome with any Violence, being upheld by Her Virginal integrity. Fulgent. Epist. ad Probum. Cap. 5. *Her Faith is invincible, euen to the Powers of Hell.* Euseb. Casar. *Præpar. Evang.* lib. 1.

10. 1. 3. If any fear to be deceived by the obscurity of a Question, let him Consult that Church concerning it, Which the Scriptures Demonstrate without any ambiguity. S. Austin. lib. Contra Crescon. C. 33. What think ye? Is not the Churches Immunity from Errour clearly established? No say Sectaries, For though we cannot confront these Passages of Scripture and Fathers, with others as significant for our Plea of Fallibility; Yet we do, and must deny their plain Sense; We do, and must say, The Roman Church has been adulterated, otherwise we are Schismatic'ks. We must say, that though once pure She lost what she had received; And therefore is now no Virgin, but a Harlot. VVe must Say, Her Faith is Vincible, That it is not safe to consult Her in dubious Matters, for She can return no better Answer, than what is fallible and may be false. Thus Sectaries.

Sectaries deny all, or must own themselves Schismaticks.

11. Hence it followes first, That our great supposed Representative, made up of Protestants, Catholics, and all other called Christians stand's without redress in an open Rebellion, in a publick Hostility with it self, And consequently taken in its whole Latitude is not Christ's Church, Because the Church of Christ is expressly founded in Unity, This supposed Representative, torn as you see in your own intestine Division is not one, And therefore most desolate, For, Omne regnum divisum in se desolabitur. And here by the way, I take leave to tell Sectaries, 'Tis but folly to talk as They do, of a Catholick Church wider than the Roman, Or of a lawful Representative possibly to be convened in Unity, out of the Body of all named Christians, For as such a Church (considered in the largest Extent) which stands divided in Faith is not Orthodox; So such an assembled Council, made up of so manyarring Believers (considered vnder that notion of Hostility and Rebellion) can be no legitimate Council. The reason is. Christ neuer owned a Church professing more Faiths than one, nor lawful Councils consisting of other Members than Orthodox Christians. You will then say Hereticks, are not to be admitted into Councils lawfully called. I Answer they are admitted, but how? Freely to dispute, not to Teach; to propose

Two Mistakes of Sectaries.

What Hereticks have done in Councils.

Ecc

402 Disc. 2. C. 14. *There is à Church of one*

pose difficulties, but not to Regulate Faith, to acquiesce in the Churches Definitions, but not to define, remaining Hereticks.

13. You see. 2. That à Church fallible in Her Definitions concerning Faith, vainly attempt's to reclaim Infidels and Hereticks from their Errours. Wherefore the Nicene Fathers Condemnation of Arius might have been iustly excepted against and pleaded reuerfible vpon this ground, That what they defined (because fallible) might be as far from Truth, as the very Errours they Censured, and defined against. Nay I say more: if that Council was then fallible, it lies yet at the mercy, not only of Arians, but of all Christians at this day, to admit, or reject, the Nicene Censure, or rather, if Prudence haue place, to suspend their Iudgements and say, no man knowes what to believe. Into such darkness, vpon such Hazard, and indifferency, Christians are cast, if God's Church or that Council could err. One instance may giue you some light.

*Strange sequels if the Church be fallible*

14. Imagin à Heathen at that time, when Arianism seemed prosperous, and carried much vogue in the East, well inclined to embrace Christian Religion, VVithall Suppose the man fully settled in this Iudgement, That Catholick Religion (much resembling Arianism) was so fallible, that both the one and other might be false. Say I beseech you How indifferent would this Iudgement haue made the Heathen, to either Religion? Nay would it not, had interest swayed neuer so little, haue drawn him more to Arianism? Yes most assuredly. For thus he might haue discoursed, and prudently. VVhat, they call Catholick Religion and Arianism are much alike, both fallible both may be false. My Interest now when Arianism flourishes, carries me thither. 'Tis true, I meet there with fallible Doctrin which may be false (God knowes how things are) but the mischief is I can find no better amongst Catholicks, nor in any other Society of Christians. Now if all I can learn be no better but fallible, and perhaps false Doctrin too, I may as well learn that from the Arians as from Catholicks, or rather ought to suspect

*How the Heathen discoursed,*

all Christian Religion of Error, because none of that Profession can assure me infallibly, what God has Said. But such Doctors teach the Heathen who may as easily teach me to know an Infinite Verity, and ascribe that to God he neuer revealed, as lead me to acquiesce in his revealed truths, (were any such truths in being) deserue no Credit, Therefore I neither can, nor will belieue any thing.

*And Concludes  
against a  
fallible  
Religion.*

15. Before we make a further Step to one or two Propositions which decide this Controversy, a few difficulties are to be cleared against the precedent Discourse. One is. Hostility ceases in the ample Council now mentioned, would all, which is only, Agree in one Truth, That Christs Church is infallible in Fundamentals only, *or fundamentals simply necessary to Salvation.* Ans: This is to say If that were done (which neuer was, nor can be done) a Reunion followes. Alas, it is not yet agreed on by all nor euer will be (vnless some quit their Errours) which and where, Christs true Church is. It is not yet nor can be agreed on, How many or few these fundamentals are, For though Catholicks and Protestants Vnite in a belief of the Trinity, and call that a Fundamental Article, The Arians stand out, and oppose both. The means then here thought of, is so far from establishing Vnion that it increaseth Diuision, And so it will euer fall out whilst a Church of one Denomination, is not acknowledged infallible in euery Doctrin She teaches, and obliges Christians to belieue vnder pain of Damnation. See more hereof above. Chap. 5. n. 5.

*One obiection  
answered.*

*Hostility  
ceases not  
but encreases  
by the  
Secretaries  
Means.*

16. A. 2. Obiection. Dissentions in Councils (witness those at Basil and Florence) or the Access of Hereticks cannot lessen their Power, or Annull their Definitions, Therefore our Plea taken from the Hostility in a most ample Council Euinces nothing. Ans. I grant the Antecedent and say, Though Heretiques and dissenting Christians meet together, yea, Though some too busily aduance opinions dissonant to truth and Orthodox Doctrin, Yet God's gracious and watchful Prouidence, which draws good out of Euil, And often conuert's War into Peace,

will with all Assurance effect that such a Council either build  
up and Define nothing, Or, if a Definition issues forth that only  
shall be defined which is certain, and infallible. Thus much is  
granted. Yet if deny the Consequence and say, The Argument  
drawn from Hostility Convinces. Here is my reason. This im-  
agined *Representative* consist's, as we now suppose, of Ariane, Pro-  
testants, Catholicks, Socinians and all other called Christians. For  
these, as some think, Collectively taken, make up the diffused  
Church of Christ more ample than the Roman, Or, if so many  
Constitute it not, Let Sectaries please to tell vs what Christians  
are to be excluded, or precisely how many are the Members of  
this diffused Catholick Body? In the mean while vouchsafe  
to Consider the force of my Argument, grounded vpon an imple-  
cable Hostility.

*The Argu-  
ment taken  
From Hosti-  
lity Convin-  
ces.*

17. This whole diffused Moral Body evidently maintains  
Contradictions. For example, *Christ is the highest God, Christ is not  
the highest God. Our Lords Sacred Body is substantially present in the  
Eucharist: That Body is not substantially present.* As therefore this  
large Society of Christians, now supposed but one great Church  
holds contradictions, So it must be granted, that the Representa-  
tive of it also hold's the same Contradictions, Or, ceaseth to  
Represent the whole Diffused Moral Body.

18. Hence one of these three Sequels inevitably follows.  
The first. If this Representative still continues to Represent  
(which is ever to be noted) and proceed's to a Definition, an-  
swerable to the Sentiment of the large Moral Body in Division,  
it necessarily Defines the Contradictions of those Churches to  
be Orthodox Doctrin, and were this done There is More then  
Hostility enough, For thus impossible Contradictions, are both  
Definable and Believable. Or, it followes 2. that our imagined  
Representative break's vp, and leaues all points in Controversy  
as Wholly vndecided as they were before; And this which implies  
an endles Hostility, would, I think, be the Result of that Coun-  
cil, And vpon that Account appear a ridiculous *Representa-  
tion.* Or 3. This followes. That some one Part or other in

*The Reasons  
and Proofs  
of my di-  
vision.*

the

the *transformation* must lay down Arms, and acknowledge one Church of One Denomination absolutely infallible, in whose Sentence all are to rest. Without this Acquiescency in one Orthodox and Infallible Church, Errours in Faith goe on as we see hitherto in a remediless condition. This truth S. Austin *de symb. ad Catechum.* C. 6. Saw well, where He speak's profoundly to my present purpose. *Ipsa est Ecclesia sancta, Ecclesia una.* She, and she only is the holy the one Church, the Catholick Church, which fights against all Heresies, she may fight, but cannot be fals'd. And Might I here Digress a little, I could Demonstrate That neuer Heresy yet of any Fame in the world appeared since Christs time, but it was Crushed centured, and condemned by one only Oracle the Roman Catholick Church, to whose Sentence the very best of Christians dutifully Submitted, relying on our famous secure Promise. *Hell gates cannot prevail against that Oracle.*

S. Austin  
speak's  
what we  
Assert.

19. A. 3. Obiection. Scripture alone though all Churches were fallible, is sufficient to reach infallible Faith necessary to Salvation. Answ. Of all Obiections proposable, this is least worth. For had Scripture that sufficiency, it may, I hope, be per-Enquired, Whether the Church also, which cannot clash with Scripture, has the like Prerogative of infallibility. Scripture was infallible when the Apostles preached, and yet their Preaching was as infallible as The words they wrote. But here is not my greatest Exception. I say scripture and all the Verities in it goe to wrack if the Church be fallible, For grant this, we haue no infallible Certainty of the Scriptures Canon, of it's substantial Purity or Immunity from corruption, of it's true Sense in a hundred controuerted passages. We cannot believe that Christ is God, or That his Ascent into Heauen was real, and not a vain Vision. We Cannot believe what Sacraments are, nor know the number of them without the Church. Therefore unless this Principle stand vnshaken. It is immediately more certain that the Church, manifested by Her Marks is Gods own Oracle, Than that Scripture, setting Church Authority aside is Gods Word, we can believe.

Scripture  
without the  
Churches  
infallible  
Testimony,  
is faith force.



believe nothing. For whose's not but that very Book would soon have been out of credit, had not God by special Assistance preserved as well it's Doctrine pure in Mens hearts, as He preserved the words in Volume or parchment, And this by the means of a watchful living Oracle his infallible Church.

*The Assertion is proved.*

20. Again, and this Reason convinceth. Were Scripture judged sufficient to teach Salvificall Faith compleatly, independently of the Church, Or were the Church (when that Judgement is) held not only errable but actually erroneous, How can any having these two Judgements ( *Scripture Infallibly teaches Faith compleatly* ). *The Church because erroneous fails in this Duty* ) Account himself a Heathen or Publican ( as our Lord saith ) though he absolutely refuse to hear the Church ? His refusal Certainly is prudent and defensible vpon this ground, That Scripture doth all, learns him enough, Therefore none can oblige him to hear the Church, which may mislead and Propound false Doctrine, For no man in his wits will listen to a Fallible Oracle, whilst he has another at hand, that teaches all Truths infallibly.

*A Reply answered.*

21. If you reply. Such an one is at least obliged to hear the Church in Fundamentals, but not in others. The Intelligent Person Asks, whether Protestants who lay that obligation vpon him of believing fundamentals only, own that *Assertion is infallible*, that to believe the *Distinction* is an Article of their Faith? If they say it is a fundamental Article and that he is obliged to believe so, Protestants doe not only maintain one infallible fundamental Point peculiar to themselves, disowned by the Roman Catholick Church ( for She certainly reiect's the Distinction ) but moreouer now become infallible Oracles, in a Matter of greatest Importance, which cannot pass, because they are Professedly fallible in all they teach, Therefore may truth have place, the Distinction giuen between fundamentals, is both *fundamental* and *fallible* Doctrine, And so without More we are freed from all Obligation of believing the Church, for that Distinction failing to be a fundamental truth, The Church is absolutely fallible in fundamental Doctrine. Well then may we not hear

*The Sectary Genuis'd of Error.*

Her

Her at all, without any Note of being looked on as Heathens, and Publicans.

22. Some perhaps, great Patrons of Christian Liberty, and freedom of mind in matters of Faith, may object. 4. The Church cannot exercise Her Authority ouer mens Iudgements, or oblige any to an internal Assent, Her power being limited and to thus much only, as to order and regulate the Exterior for this end, that Vnity and peace May be preserued without publick Dissention. Answ. These men certainly neuer say their Creed. I believe the holy Catholick Church, that is in mind intirely. I giue Assent to all the Catholick Church teaches, Now if this Doctrin stand, They may well not yeild Assent at all to any Doctrin the Church teaches, but like Hypocrits may outwardly be fair Catholicks, and inwardly foul Hereticks, And this is, to Profess one thing, and believe another. Christ is ashamed of them. Luke. 9. 26. and so is the Apostle also Rom. 1. 16. VWho blushed not to preach as he believed, And to believe as he preached. But enough hereof is said in the other Treatise.

*A Reflection  
made upon  
Christian  
Libertines.*

**CHAF.**

## CHAP. XV.

*Divine Faith in this present State of things, necessarily requir's a Church infallible. The Reason hereof. The Church neither Defin's, nor can Define by Humane Authority only. Her Definitions, more than morally certain, are Infallible. Sectaries Recourse to Moral certainty in Matters of Faith, a most frigid Plea. Their Fallacy is discovered. Objections Answered*

*One Principle promised.*

*The perfection of Faith.*

1. **O**ne Principle established above. N. 6. Proves the first part of my Assertion. *Divine Faith which is a firm Assent to what ever God speak's So ultimately rest's vpon his Infallible Verity.* That if a true Believer yeild Assent to him *as He speaks, and because He speaks*, All the power in Heauen cannot Separate Infallibility from that Belief. Herein consist's the Perfection of all Divine Faith, That without sweruing, it tend's vpon a *very Infallible*, and without Hesitancy hold's that infallibly true, which the infallible Verity Reueal's. A lesser Perfection than this is not Faith, And a greater the Apostles had not, if we precisely respect the Motiue of their Assent, Hence all must Distinguish a twofold Infallibility, *One* intrinick, and infinit, proper to Gods Verity, The *Other* answerable to a creatures Capacity, (*finite*, 'tis true), yet Infallible, and such the Apostles Faith was.

2. Thus much Supposed, not easily gainsaid by Sectaries, the infallibility of one Church which we say is the Roman Catholick, Stand's firm. And here is the Reason. As Faith relies vpon an infallible Verity that reueal's Truth, So it also rests vpon

upon an infallible Oracle, which (without danger of Errour) Applies and Proposes that very Truth yet obscure, to Believers, For it little avail's to have a Verity infallibly Reuealed, if a fallible Oracle which may both Miss and Millcad, be our best and only Guide, or Proponent. The Church therefore which Faith Indubitably, I Propose what God Reueals, must be infallible, inferable to the Infallibility of Diuine Reuelation. Ruin the One or Other Infallibility, Faith can be no more but an vncertain Assent. And consequently no Faith at all.

*One ground  
of the  
Churches  
Infallibility.*

3. To Reinforce this Reason. Please only to cast a serious Thought vpon such as haue been iustly reputed Hereticks, and vpon their Procedure. The Arians after the reading Scripture denyed the high Godhead in Christ, His Eternal *Consubstantiality* also to the Father, And erred. The Pelagians reiecting Original Sin, swerued likewise from the Verities of Christian Religion; so did the Monothelits that impiously bereaued Christ of his two Sacred *Wills*, Diuine and Humane. The true Church, All know condemned, and yet condemns these Tenets as Heretical. Right say modern Sectaries, And it was well done. Very Good. If *not done*, herevpon ensues another troublesome Question, and it is. Whether that true Church, whilst She condemned these Errours and defined the contrary Truths, proceeded *Doubtfully*, *probably*, vpon *Moral Certainty only*, or Spake as Gods Oracle ought to speak, *Infallibly*? If She Defined doubtfully, it is yet also doubtful whether Christ be the high God, and Consubstantial to his Father, Vnless Scripture (now supposed Gods word) in *express Terms* clear the doubt, and raise the Doctrin to absolute Certainty, which most evidently is not done.

*The reason  
reinforced.*

*If the  
Church de-  
fines doubt-  
ful.*

4. The whole Contest then is, VWhether the Church or Arians Interpret Scripture better, For the Object of my Assent when I belue the eternal *VWord*, *Consubstantial*, being not *Express Scripture*, but an Interpretation only, it followes, if the Interpretation which the Church giues be supposed doubtful, She wrong's the Arians, and all other Christians, whilst She obliges them to belue the Mystery otherwise than only, *Sub dubio* or

*Fff*

*doubt.*

*She wrongs  
both Arians  
and All  
Christians*

doubtfully, which is not to believe at all. Again If the Church Definition get a Step higher, to a degree of Probability and no more, The Arians Opinion for ought we know yet, may be as tenable as the Contrary Doctrine now supposed Orthodox, And Consequently the real Consubstantiality of the Son to his Father, is no more any Object of Faith, but merely a disputable Matter like this or that Opinion in Schools, earnestly tossed to and fro, But never ended. Doubts therefore, And meer probabilities rejected, too weightles for Church Definitions,

*The Secta-  
rists Plan of  
Moral Cer-  
tainity exa-  
mined.*

5. We are next to look a little into one only Refuge left Sectaries, called *Moral Certainty*. 'Tis a dark cloud, they are lately got into, our Endeavour shall be to dissipate it. They may say. When the Church condemned Ariamism (the like is of any other Heresy) and defined the External Word Consubstantial. The Definition (much above Probability) though not absolutely Infallible, was yet so morally Certain that no man can, but most unreasonably, doubt of its Verity. In passing, I may without Offence take notice of Sectaries Inconsequences, and Ask, if Moral Certainty be at least had from Church Definitions, when She interpret's Scripture, though the Doctrine be not formally express'd There, Why are not Her Definitions every whit as Morally certain against Luther and Calvin, though what She Defines be not in *express Terms* Gods word? I would also as willingly learn, why Protestant Doctrine is not esteemed over all the world as Morally certain as these Ancient Catholick Definitions are? But let these Queries, not easily Answered pass, We come to the main difficulty, and demand.

*A question  
Proposed to  
Seditious;*

6. Whether this Positive Doctrine. *Christ is the Begotten and Consubstantial to his Father* be a Fundamental Article of Christian Faith finally resolvable into the Divine Revelation, And admitted as most Fundamental by Protestants? I verily persuade my self they will Say it is: If not, This follows inevitably, that there is no fundamental Article in our Christian faith. Upon the supposed Concession I Argue. But If the Church be infallible, this Positive Doctrine. *Christ is Consubstantial.* is no Article

of Faith because it cannot be resolved into an infinite Verity infallibly Reuealing Truth, Therefore it is only a Moral humane Perswasion at most, which may be false.

7. The Proof of the *Minor*, will best appear if we Ask why *Scharies* belieue that positive Doctrin? They cannot Answer, Scripture expressly Teaches it, For most evidently that's not so. Will they say the Mystery may by good Discourse be deduced from Scripture? I Could wish to see a clear Deduction, yet fear it. However Suppose that done, new Doubts arise concerning the certainty of the Deduction, which can be no more but morally certain, most insufficient to ground Diuine Faith. The true Answer therefore must be, or none. The Nicene Council The both past, and Present Church faithfully interpreting Scripture, Definitiuely deliuered the Doctrin, and vpon this ground we belieue the Mystery.

*The true  
Answer  
proves Faith  
Certain.*

8. Now here we come to the main Business, and Ask again, whether God speaking by this Church as his own Oracle, Propounds that Doctrin and obliges all to belieue it, Or, Contrariwise, whether the Church diuorced as it were from Diuine Assistance teaches vpon Her own humane fallible Authority, And obliges all to belieue the Mystery? Grant the first, The Definitions of the Church are infallible, because an Eternal Verity speaks infallibly by Her. Say secondly, That the Church wholly Unassisted, teaches and Defines vpon Her own fallible humane Authority, the Doctrin we learn from Her of the Incarnation, of the highest Godhead in Christ, of his being *Consubstantial*, of the *Most Trinity*, of *Original Sin*, begets no Faith, Because if the Supposition hold's, that Assent relies not at all vpon an *Infallible* *Power* speaking by the Church *Assisted*, but vpon a weak and fallible Human Authority which cannot support any certain Beliefs, For it is most preposterous to Say, that men merely fallible, as all are left to Themselves, can Assure vs, what that Doctrin is, which God Reueals Infallibly. Now we Come to this Moral Certainty.

*The Church  
has Infalli-  
bility fur-  
ther euinced*

9. And one Perhaps will say, Such men, though fallible, may



may at least give *Moral Assurance* of the truth of the Doctrine, and that's enough. Contra. 1. Moral assurance which euer involves some weak Degree of fear of the contrary may in rigour be false. But the Church, which obliges all to believe Her Doctrine under pain of Damnation speaks without fear, and Saith boldly, God reveals as I teach, Therefore her Doctrine if false, is the Devils Doctrine. But none can say, That the Nicene Definition against Arius was the Doctrine of Devils, But Contrarywise a Truth revealed by God, and Believable *Fide Divina*, Ergo it was infallible, and more than Morally certain. Contra. 2. God Speaking by the Church gives greater Certainty than Moral, And if he do not speak at all by Her, the Definition now removed from Infallible Assistance Vpholds not Faith, as we shall presently, nor can it be prudently judged morally certain.

*The Churches Definitions more than Morally certain,*

10. Though much be said in the other Treatise. Disc. 1. C. 4. 6. against this Pretence to Moral certainty (Sectaries casually light on it because, forsooth, they brook not the word *Infallibility*) yet here we must wholly weaken that Plea. I say Therefore, could the Church (as She cannot) Define or teach without Gods special Assistance, Christians would either not attain to so great certainty of Her Doctrine, as is Moral; Or if no greater could be had, That certainty would not be *Divine Faith*. Every one knows Moral certainty to be a kind of knowledge, whereby men judge such things are, or are not, without great Hesitancy or any reasonable cause of Doubting, It is vitally grounded upon some vulgar Persuasion, or common half owned Evidence, which the most of men trust to prudently, When no sure can be had. Thus we say. All People in Common Conversation are not always contrary to their thoughts. Some mean well in their proceeding. Rome and Constantinople are now Cities in being. These and the like Assertions may in rigour be false, Yet our Indifferent faculty without Violence readily yeilds to all, induced thereunto by a Persuasion vulgarly received whereby we say, That as such things are Commonly reported, So they also are vitally believed, and Commonly true. In a word the greatest part of Moral certainty

*The Nature of Moral certainty briefly considered.*

may be rightly stiled à kind of half Supposed Evidences, current in the world, which may Deceiue, yet easily deceiues

*Aristotle*

*No Power  
deceivable  
can ground  
Faith.*

*The insuffi-  
ciency of  
Moral  
Certainty.*

11. Now be pleased to reflect. The sublime Mysteries of Faith, remote from all vulgar Apprehensions and half owned Evidences, are neither visible like Constantinople, seen by innumerable Eye-witnesses, Nor assured vpon any either Fassible or decernible Authority, nor finally belieued vpon à meer humane prudential Discourse only. No. They lie in à higher Region above our natural knowledge in the Abyss of Gods inscrutable Wisdom, and the more remote they are from Sense Or any Half-evidences, the more they stand in need of an infallible Pronouncement, Whereby All rest Ascertained of their being Eternal Truths. Hence I Argue. None but God about who Reueals, and an infallible Church which Proposes the Mysteries can giue Assurance of their being Diuine Truths, or say absolutely They ought to be belieued answerably to their Dignity, *as Diuine*. Now further. But if God reueal's them as his own Truths for this End; that all belieue them infallibly, the Church cannot but Speak in the name of God, and independently of this Vulgar humane knowledge, Propose them also infallibly as Diuine, Or if She could turn vs off with no more but à Moral Perswasion of their *seeming* Gods truths, yet may not be so, The Strength of Faith vanishes into à dissatisfactory Topick, into à meer *perhaps* thus. *It may be We Believe Truth, it may be not.* In à word we believe not as the Apostles did, infallibly.

12. Hence none, I think, shall euer comprehend how this Whimsy of Moral-Certainty got into our Protestants thoughts, For had Christians agreed in that Certainty, or had they said: Because the Mysteries of faith are proposed so weakly, *We can believe with no Stronger assurance but Moral*, They must haue learned and learn'd that Doctrin (not from their own fancy) but from some Superiour Power, some known Oracle that taught so, which either reuealed, or proposed the Mysteries as only Morally certain, and no more. But to point at any such Ora-

*Faith only  
Morally cer-  
tain: revealed  
by all that  
taught  
Christianity*

de is impossible, And here is the reason. All know, that God an infallible Verity, cannot Reveal any Truth only Morally Certain. Christ our Lord taught his own Verities infallibly, so also did the Apostles who were Strangers to this low and lame Assurance. No ancient Christians nameable professed a less certainty (of Faith) than infallible in the Church which taught them. The Roman Catholick Church you see for convincing Reasons, laies claim to diuine Assistance when She Teaches, and disclaims this petty kind of Certainty, which may be false: From whence then came the Perswasion of that certainty into mens Heads when neither God, nor Christ, nor Apostles nor Ancient Christians, nor any Orthodox Church ever fauoured it?

*The Author  
of Moral  
certainty.*

*It is vfeles  
to Sectaries  
in all Dis-  
putes.*

13. The true Answer is, *inimicus homo hoc fecit*. An old Enemy to decry the Infallibility of Gods own Oracle conueyed the fancy into a few Sectaries, Though when they haue it, it becomes wholly vfeles to end Controuerfies. Obserue my reason. If these men Dispute with a Iew, will they say that Christian Religion, taken in what latitude you please, is not absolutely infallible, but only a little More morally certain than Iudaism? Or if they Argue against vs can they be so shameless, as to allow Moral certainty to Protestancy and deny it to Catholick Religion? They must do so, and here is the reason. Moral certainty is neuer applicable to two Parts of a Contradiction; The One must of necessity be made morally Improbable, (so if all iudge in this Instant that Constantinople is a City in being, the Contrary is Morally improbable) if therefore Sectaries hold Protestancy Morally certain and the Roman Catholick Doctrin not, This becomes in their Opinion Morally Improbable. Dare they say so much with any Countenance? If they doe, our Dispute begins a fresh, we come to the Trial of their Assertion, and will now when it pleases them to hear, that their high challenge to Moral certainty, is far from being probable. At least this is Evident, That whilst we most rationally except against it, its only an vnproued Supposition and ends no Controuerfies.

16. To discover yet more the Unweighiness of this weak *Argument* in Matters of Faith, Imagin if you please First. (it is in this present State an impossible Supposition yet gives light to me (I would say) that the Church had not Proposed at all the divine Mystery of the Sacred Trinity, As it is already significantly Defined. Suppose again that twenty learned men, (but fallible) after a perusal of Scripture had endeavored to bring Themselves and others to believe it. viz. *The Father of himself born and unbegotten, the Son Coequal and Eternal, begotten, The holy Ghost Eternal also and proceeding from Father and Son. All three consubstantial, one in Essence, in Power, in Wisdom, in Omnipotency, only distinguished by their Relative Oppositions.* I say notwithstanding; Tho their Assent would only have been a weak Opinion not morally certain, and though hundreds more had Sided with these Twenty upon the like Ground, none could have believed the Trinity with Divine Faith. The reason is, Because whilst men nearly fallible (and as fallible) Propose an incomprehensible Mystery far above the reach of humane understanding, The Proposal (relying upon a deceivable, Or an unsustained Power) cannot bring Faith to it's own Object, *Gods infallible veracity.* The Rejection of this supposed Faith clears all. For Ask why They believe the Trinity? It is Answered they verily think and perceive Themselves that the Mystery lies couched in Holy Writ. Enquire again, whether that Thought or Persuasion be not fallible, they Answer, *affirmatively.* Ergo, Say I, their Faith which cannot go beyond the strength of that weak Proposition, is also fallible and consequently not Divine.

17. Here you see first, the absolute Necessity of an infallible Proponent in Points of Faith, which Sectaries have not, And therefore can believe nothing Divinely. And truly Catholicks could be in as bad a Condition (yea really so Catholicks) could the Church only guess at these high Mysteries, could She propose them upon a humane errable Authority only, Or in a word, Define Fallibly. You see. 2. Upon what ground the Faith of a Catholick is infallible, For being demanded why He believes

An Instance

Proving  
Moral  
Certainty  
insufficient.

An Infallible  
proposition,  
necessary

416 Disc 2. C. 15. *Diuine Faith requires*

belieues this, or any other Mystery, his Answer is, God reueals them. Questioned again who giues him so much Assurance? A satisfactory Reply is at hand. He belieues so, because an Assisted Church, which cannot Err, Proposes all Her Mysteries infallibly. Take away Diuine Assistance, She is errable and may deceiue every one She teaches.

*Scitharies  
haue no  
faith moral-  
ly certain.*

16. One may here demand whether the Protestants Belief of the Trinity, or of any other high Mystery growes vp to so much Certainty with them, as is Moral? Answ. 1. It imports little whether it do or no, So long as their Faith is meere ly- lible. I Answer 2. If we Speak rigorously, Their Belief is not morally certain. Here is my reason. Their own Diuining is so abstruse à Matter cannot raise the Assent so high, And if they would borrow, as it were, Certainty from the Catholick Church, and Apply that to Themselues, They know well this Oracle Or- nes no other Certainty in the Belief of reuealed Truths, but what is infallible, and cannot be False.

*An Objec-  
tion.*

*Moral Cer-  
tainty,  
grounded on  
Sensible  
Euidence  
giues not  
Faith any  
Assurance.*

17. By what is said already we easily Solue à common Ob- iection. Moral certainty seems often equiualent, yea wholly as satisfac- ry to reason, as that is we call Physical, For one that neuer in Constantinople can no more Question the Being of such à City, than doubt of the sun's shining at Noon day. Answ. All is most true, but nothing to the purpose, For, that certainty There- fore equalizes physical, because (Originally grounded vpon à sensible visible Euidence) it is taken from innumerable Witnesses who haue seen the place, This makes the common Report in- dubitable, and conueyes vnto vs à certainty as firm, as if we saw Constantinople with our Eyes. But the Mysteries of Faith lie, as is now noted in à higher Region, and are neither proposed nor conueyed to vs by the help of any visible or sensible Eui- dence; And were they in some low degree morally certain vpon humane Reports, that would neither match, nor be so strong as natural Euidence is. Wherefore God interposes his own As- sistance and raises the Proposition of these Mysteries and our Be-

ed of them, to a yet higher Degree of certitude far above either Moral or Physical, For whether we consider them as Truths revealed by an *infallible Verity*, or proposed by the Church *Divinely Assisted*, They stand firm vpon infallible Principles. And thus we have their Truth indubitably conveyed, And the Conveyance you see, admits of nothing but Infallibility. I say *the Truth*, For without doubt there is a strong visible and sensible Evidence in the Marks and Motives which Denote Christs Church, and make Her Doctrin in the highest manner *indubitably Credible*, But thereof you shall hear more partly in the Obiections, But most amply in the third Discourse.

To end this point concerning Moral Certainty. I Ask (and for Answer appeal to the Iudgement of euery rational-man) what cold comfort would it haue been to the Primitive Christians, had the Nicene Fathers after a resolute Definition issued forth, whereby the *Consubstantiality* of the Diuine Word was Asserted, and a Peremptory *Anathema* Pronounced against all that belieued it not, Declared themselves and Sense in this frigid manner? It is so indeed Defined. But we only mean thus much, That the Doctrin is morally certain and may be false. Would not Arius think ye haue slighted the Definition? And might he not haue Argued to the purpose Thus? If no man can hold himself happy for being actually in Errour, He cannot Certainly think himself out of the danger of an vnhappy State, if he be exposed to the danger of Errour, But the Moral certainty you defend thrusts you vpon the danger of being in Errour, Therefore your Condition is none of the surest, Nay is as bad as mine, For the worst that can befall my Doctrin, which I pretend Scripture for, is, That it may one day proue false, and so may yours too (Good Fathers) if in the least degree false.

Hence You see first, That the Definitions of Christs evidenced Church must either be owned infallible, And then meer Moral certainty hath no place, Or Hereticks may endlessly call on Her Doctrin and boldly say, nothing is taught nothing,

Ggg

can

Moral Certainty in Faith is most frigid Plea. And why?



*To except  
against the  
Churches  
Infallibility  
destroys  
Faith.*

*The Sessi-  
ons Para-  
dox.*

*Inferences.*

*What ever  
makes  
Faith true  
makes it  
Infallible.*

can be believed infallibly. If you Reply. Many caust and except against the Churches Infallibility. I answer. This is to say, Exception is made against a Truth which either must stand vnshaken, or Faith (made no more but a tottering Opinion) is destroyed. And Mark in what a Distress poor Christians are, who Ask. *Domine quo ibimus?* Lord whither shall we goe to learn Eternal truth? Protestants will needs draw vs from a Church hitherto held infallible, And to afford a better prouision of Truth, remit vs to Themselues, who confessedly are fallible in all they Teach. A Paradox beyond Expression. *The Church is supposed fallible, and Protestants are really fallible.* Where then is our Security? From whom shall we learn Truth? From no body. But more of this hereafter.

20. You se. 2. There is not one receiued Christian Principle so much as seemingly fauourable to Moral certainty only which may be fals, or which forces That vpon the Churches Definitions. Whereas, on the contrary, *Scripture Councils, and Fathers* Positiuely Avert Church Doctrin to be infallible. You se. 3. To pretend to true Faith or to true Religion divorced from Infallibility, Destroys Both, For although euery Truth be not infallible, yet Truth and Infallibility inseparably meet in Faith. Wherefore this Inference inuolably hold's good. My Catholick Faith is true. Ergo it is infallible. For Faith relies vpon, And is vltimately Resolved into God's infallible Veracity, which (with the Concurrence of other Principles requisite) Transfuses into it a Supereminent infallibility aboue all natural Certitude. That Therefore which makes Faith true, makes it also Infallible. Now further to our present Purpose. God as we here Suppose reuealed the *Consubstantiality* of his Son Infallibly, But the Mystery lies dark in Scripture, The Church impowred to Propose exactly eternal reuealed Truths, Answerable to Her Trust and the weightines of the matter, speak's not like one faint hearted, *Forsooth, Morally speaking Christ is the highest God. The Word is Consubstantial,* But Asserts it without all Peraduentures, And strik's Arianism dead with one only Definition. And thus Faith stand's firm vpon

upon a double infallibility, the *One* infinite and Essential to God's Verity, The *Other*, the infallible Proposition of an Assisted Church, For as She Proposes the obscure Mysteries of Faith, so we believe. Whereof more presently.

*Other Objections proposed by Sectaries, Solved. More of Moral certainty.*

21. One, though enough broken already, must appear again in our New mens Terms, or nothing is done. Thus they Discourse. If Christian Doctrin be in so high a Degree Morally Certain, As it is Certain that Cæsar, Pompey and Cicero were men once in Being, None can reasonably doubt of the Doctrin, And why may not Such an Assurance Content vs, without our pretended Infallibility? I read this in Mr Stillingfleet more then once, And had I not seen it with my own Eyes, I Should never have thought, That One Professing Knowledge in Divinity could haue erred so enormously. To lay open the foule Mistake.

*Sectaries  
Mistake  
concerning  
Moral cer-  
tainty.*

22. All know the Certainty we haue of Cæsars once being in the world was first groundd vpon a Visible clear Euidence, for Innumerable saw the man, heard him Speak, whilst He liued on earth. The Verity euer since conueyd down from Age to Age Continues still to our dayes, And here is all the Moral Certainty men can haue of Cæsar, of Pompey, or of any other, so remote from vs. Please now to obserue. As Cæsar and Cicero were seen by many Eye-witnesses, So Christ our Lord was both heard and seen by Innumerable when he Preached, and suffered on the Cross. The Euidence to those Spectators was Sensible and Physical, To Iewes and Gentils now, its Moral, who vpon a Vniuersal report Say without boggling, There was once a man in the world called Christ, as they say, There was once One, Called Cæsar. But (and here we Come to discouer

*To say  
Christ was  
upon Moral  
certainty*

*is not to be-  
lieve in  
Christ.*

*What is to  
believe in  
Christ.*

*Faith is  
more than  
morally  
Certain*

*A Convin-  
cing reason  
hereof,*

Mr Stillingsfleets Error) Do These Iewes and Gentils therefore believe in Christ, or Assent to his Sacred Doctrin by Faith; because they Iudge upon Moral Certainty, He was once on earth. Is this Truth, I say, As it is grounded upon a Common Report, or Morally Certain the Object of Faith? It is more then ridiculous. For grant That, All the Iewes in Europe at this Day may be well thought to Believe in Christ, because they have Moral Certainty of his once Being in the world.

23. To Believe in Christ Therefore, is not to Say, such a man once had his Being, he Preach'd, and suffered (for this lay open to Sense) But implies Much more. viz. To Assent indubitably upon Divine Revelation. That the Man called Christ Iesus was truly the Highest God, The only Messias, The Redeemer of Mankind, Consubstantial to his Eternal Father and finally to Assent to Euery Doctrin he taught. These and the like Truths (neither visible nor sensible, like Cæsar) are Objects of Divine Faith, far enough removed from Physical and Moral Certainty, And we firmly Assent to All, not because they are seen with our Eyes, or Scientifically known, Or finally Conveyed vnto vs upon the weak Support of Moral certainty, But because God an Infinite Verity has revealed them. Here is our Ground. Now This Revelation being not evidently known by virtue of any Principle in Nature, must be Believed (together with the Obscure Mysteries, *Attended*) by an Act of Divine Faith.

24. And Hence it followes, That as no Object (*as far as Evidently known*) Can terminate Supernatural Faith; So no Moral Certainty can be essential to it, Or uphold it. The vniuersal Reason hereof is most Conuincing, and Briefly thus. *When God reveals (as it is revealed) is Certain and Infallible Doctrin. Wherefore, He or those that take from this infallible revealed Doctrin, its own intrinsic Certainty, And make it no More but Morally Certain by God the first Verity, and iniure all Christians, who are to learn it as Infallible, But Sectaries do So, That is, they vnaturally take Gods infallible Doctrin out of its own intrinsic Certainty, and Say its only Morally Certain to vs, Therefore they wrong that*

do not first Verity and abuse all Christians. This Principle alone proves the Churches Infallibility, And utterly ruin's the Protestants Pretence to Moral Certainty, whereof you Shall haue More hereafter.

25. Now to deal fairly with Mr Stillingfleet, let vs at present falsely Suppose Moral Certainty à sufficient ground of Faith, what Good for Gods sake get Protestants by that? Can They tell vs where the Church is, whose Doctrin must be reputed only morally certain? The Arians call themselves à Church, so do the Græcians, the Protestants likewise, and finally so do Catholicks. Are all these different iarring Doctrins Morally certain? Evidently No. For the Professors of them maintain Contradictions, vterly Destructiue both of Moral and all other Certainty. Some One Society therefore teaches it, For more than *One* (if diuided in faith-) cannot, This *One* must be Signified and pointed out, which no Protestant can do, For if he name his own Church he hath the whole world against him, and will be forced to proue his Assertion vpon indubitable Principles: And if he point at the Roman Catholick Church, he ruin's his own cause, For two opposite Churches cannot teach Doctrin morally Certain. Now if he can point at no Church of One Denomination teaching Doctrin Morally certain, This *certainly* is only an insignificant word in the aire, applicable to no Christian Society.

26. A second obiection. The Motiues of Credibility though commonly held only Inducements morally certain, so Denote the true Church, that all may find it out, Therefore though Church Doctrin were only morally Certain, and not Infallible, it may sufficiently lead to belieue that Doctrin which God has Reuealed. Answ. Here is neither Parity nor any Inference consequential, And the want of distinguishing between the *Credibility* of Reuealed Doctrin and its Truth, breed's the Confusion. The Motiues then only make the Doctrin *evidently Credible*, and remit vs to the Church which teaches Truth, She proposes the Doctrin, and vpon Her Proposition Faith relies, which therefore

Were  
Church  
Doctrin only  
Morally  
certain,  
Sectaries yet  
gain No-  
thing.

Faith relies  
not vpon  
Motiues im-  
ducing to  
Beliefe.

must be infallible, not vpon the Motiues too weak to support Faith. In a word here is all I would say. God Reueals infallibly, the Motiues in a General way manifest the Church where truth is taught, the Church thus Signalized Proposes Truth infallibly, And vpon Her infallible Proposition (not for the Motiues.) Christians belieue Infallibly.

whether the  
Churches  
Proposition  
may be  
Call'd the  
Object of  
Faith?

27. A third Obiection. If the Churches Proposition be infallible, or if God speaks by the Church As he anciently did by the Prophets and Apostles, And She likewise Speaks in his name. Whereuer this Oracle Proposes may be called the Voice of God, and Consequently the Formal Object of Faith. I answer no hurt at all were it so, For perhaps in this present State of things, few Articles of Faith are, or can be believed independently of the Churches Proposition. At least it is very easy to say. I Believe the Sacred Trinity because God anciently Reuealed it to the Apostles, and also because the Church now Testifies that the Mystery was anciently Reuealed. Howeu'r we here waue this Doctrin and Say. The Churches Proposition, though absolutely infallible, is not properly speaking the Formal Object of Faith, Though much may be *de Nomine*. First, because it is meerly Accidental, not Essential to Faith, to be proposed by the Church, by this, or that Oracle, For Christ our Lord at his first Preaching was not the Church, yet he Proposed Articles to be Belieued, and most Infallibly. 2. Diuines by the word *Formal Object*, usually vnderstand the Ancient infallible Reuelation made to the Prophets and Apostles, And not the Churches Proposition, which though it be an Intrinsic, Essential, and Necessary Condition *completing*, and *Applying* the Ancient Reuelation to Belieuers, yet Principally it Terminates not Faith. Now to be an essential Condition, nothing at all impairs the Churches Infallibility. Thus much is said to solve the Obiection, though the Matter, 'tis true, is capable of higher Speculation, but Sectaries like not Speculative Learning.

28. A fourth Obiection. The Churches Infallibility seems chiefly Asserted vpon this Ground, that She is to be Heard, and Obeyed,

Church, which proves nothing. For Iudges, Gouvernours, and Pastors are to be heard and obeyed, though all are fallible. Answer. A most silly Obiection. The very Matter, wherein These and the Church are to be Obeyed Shewes the disparity, For No Civil Magistrate pretend's to regulate Faith, or to Define what God would's. This the Church, and She only is impowred to do, To crush Heresies as they rise vp, and to establish without Error the contrary Truths, which cannot be effected (the matter being so Sublime) without the infallible Assistance of the Holy Ghost. Now we are to Proceed to the main Business in hand.

*The Disparity between  
Gouvernours  
-Common-  
ding and the  
Church dis-  
fining.*

## CHAP. XVI.

*Principles premised to the following Doctrin. The Roman Catholick Church is a Church of One Denomination. She, and no other Society of Christians, is Infallible. Other Grounds of Her Infallibility laid forth. The Infallibility of Councils maintained against Mr Stillington's Supposed Truth and Reason. There are no Principles whereby Approv'd Councils can be proved Reliable. Sectaries Convinced by their own Doctrin.*

**W**E here first Premise three certain Principles. One, that the Doctrin of all Churches severally Denominated from their Authors, as Arianism from the Arians, Protestantism from Protestants, Christian Verities from Christ our Lord, rest in the whole (or totally) considered vnder One Notion of Christian Doctrin) either *True* or *Infallible*, For in this whole diffused Body, We evidently find Contradictions. The Arians condemn Protestants, These Set against Arians, And the Catholicks

*One Principle, importing the  
Disunion  
in Faith.*



424 Disc. 2. C. 16. *The Roman Catholick Church*

lick Church Opposes both. Therefore All of them maintain neither *One*, nor *true*, nor *infallible* Catholick Doctrin, And consequently infallibility ceases in the *Whole*, when the several Parts stand in an implacable Opposition with One another.

*Another Principle.*

2. A. 2. Principle. If all Churches which Contradict One another are not infallible, One only, and of one Denomination must be infallible, or none at all can be so. For example. Catholicks, and Protestants, teach Contrary Doctrin (the like is of all other dissenting Societies) both Parties cannot be infallible, Therefore the One is so, or Neither. Now further Protestants disclaim the Prerogative of teaching infallibly; whence it follows First, That the Roman Catholick Church enjoys that Privilege, or there is no such thing on earth as an infallible Church. Secondly this is Consequent, It is the same to Say. *The Roman Catholick Church is infallible*, as to Say, *that God yet Prefers an infallible Church in Being*. This I Assert, not only because Protestants quit all Pretence to infallibility, but upon this ground chiefly, That no other Society nameable can parallel this One Oracle in Her Marks and Signs, Illustrious Miracles, admirable Conversions, Sanctity, the blood-shedding of Martyrs. By these Signs the Infallibility of this present Church is no less rationally proved, than the Infallibility of the Primitive Church in the Apostles time. Here I Petition our Aduersaries to give a probable Disparity.

*The present Church proved by her Signs as Infallible as the Primitive.*

*Different ways of Teaching infallible Doctrin.*

3. A. 3. Principle. One may teach true Christian Doctrin, and yet not Propose it *as infallible*. So all do that hold the Definitions of the Church only morally Certain. One again may teach infallible Christian Doctrin, and yet not teach it *infallibly*. And thus Sectaries teach the General Truths of Christianity, of *one God*, and of *one Christ*. The Doctrin, obiectively attested by Divine Revelation is in it self infallible, But these Novels for want of Divine Assistance, teach it not *infallibly*, And therefore Confess themselves so fallible that they may sever from Truth. Finally, One may teach, true and infallible Cat-

this Doctrin with this Addition, That he Teaches it *infallibly*. And these three Perfections now named, were most Eminent in the Preaching of Christ and His Apostles. They Taught true Doctrin, They taught *infallible Doctrin*, and moreover taught it *infallibly*, In so much that their very formal Teaching was not liable to Errour. Thus much Premised, here is my Assertion.

4. The Roman Catholick Church is Gods infallible living Oracle, and teaches not only Christs true and infallible Doctrin, But moreover Deliivers it so infallibly that She cannot err. The Proof of the Assertion wholly depend's vpon à Discourse in the other Treatise. Disc. 1. C. 2. and in the Appendix. P. 2. 3. 4. Whence I Argue. If once you annul this one Principle, that à Church which pretend's to teach Christs Sacred Doctrin, teaches it so fallibly that She may Deceiue, it doth not only follow that one Eminent Perfection in our Sauours Preaching (who taught infallibly) is vtterly lost, and now remoued from vs, But this is also consequent, That no man can haue assurance of so much as of one Christian Verity at this day Proposed or taught the whole world ouer. The Reason is. Whateuer Church teaches Christian Doctrin fallibly, can say no more but thus much timidly, That (as taught) it may by virtue of the Proposition be false, but à Doctrin so far remoued from infallible Certainty for want of à due Application of its Infallibility, comes not neer to the Doctrin of Christ and his Apostles, which was Applied, Taught, and Proposed *infallibly*. Therefore such à Doctrin if valued by the merit of its Delivery, Can be esteemed no more but à weak vncertain humane perswasion, not at all resoluable into Gods infallible Verity. For though God own's à Doctrin obiectiueuly True, and infallible (because he Reueals it) yet he vtterly disowns such à Proposal as discountenances that Worth, and makes it look like à changling, or dislike it Self, (That is) neither True, nor infallible, but contrarywise *Possibly false and fallible*. And it neither is, nor can be more to Christians than fallible, if proposed *fallibly*.

5. The Case is thus, As if one had à Gem of mighty Value, and

*The Roman  
Catholick  
Church is  
Gods Infallible  
Oracle.*

*The Assertion  
proved,*

426 Disc. 2. C. 16. *The Roman Catholick Church*

*An Instance*

*The Assertion further declares d.*

and skilful Jewellers were appointed to Prize it, yet none after all Art and Industry used can know the true worth Thereof. The Jewel may indeed be precious, and perhaps not. More the most skilful cannot Say. Put this case, the Owner would be little enriched by such an unknown treasure whilst the worth is not known. And no More Say I, are Christians now enriched with Christs Precious Verities, whilst none can esteeme of Their vltimate Value nor Say *infallibly*, They are Gods own infallible Truths: Moral certainty has here no place, For the Reasons alleged aboue. Hence it followes, That as God Reueals his verities of an Immense Valuation (*True and infallible*) So Providence has ordained that they be Proposed answerably to their due Estimate, *truly*, and *infallibly*, without which Their vnfinis to ground Faith is more than palpable, as will appear by the Resolving any one act now held *de Fide*. Please to obserue. We and Sectaries belieue the Diuine word Consubstantial to his Father, the Church Proposes that infallible Truth, but as it is now Supposed, *Fallibly*, the Assent which followes vpon the Proposition and should be Diuine, reaches not so high, because it Answers not to the Strength of the infallible obiectiue Verity in it Self (yet not asserted by any, as infallible) But to the weakness of the *formal Proposition*, which is supposed so fallible that it may be false. All then that a Belieuer can Say by virtue of that weak Light is thus much only, and no more. *Perhaps the Diuine Word is Consubstantial, perhaps not*, For none doth or can asseert the Truth otherwise, but as a thing doubtful or indifferent to truth and falshood.

6. The Reason *a Priori* of all now said is. We neither know, nor belieue by external *Obiectiue Truths* considered in Themselues, but by our own *subiectiue internal Acts*, as therefore an Obiectiue Truth appears in our own internal Acts, of so much worth it is to vs, And neither more nor less. Now further. My internal Faith necessarily depend's on two external Obiects when I belieue any Mystery: The first is *Gods Revelation*, The other the *Churches Proposition*: Neither the one or other

other is my true Faith, for that's inherent in me, if I believe. When therefore the Church after Her Proposition obliges me to Settle my internal Faith vpon the Diuine Reuelation, I rationally demand in what manner, Or how I shall fix it? Knowing well, if God speaks he speak's infallibly, But my Scruple is whether the Church can infallibly Assure me so much? If She Answer's truly She doth so, I am secure vpon this Principle, that an Oracle teaches which cannot Deceiue. But if it be replied, She is only impowred to Propose reuealed Truths *fallibly*, and I by my internal Assent close, as it were, with *That*, or lay hold of the reuealed object iust so as it is proposed *fallibly*, most evidently my Assent and Belief, is no more but Fallible.

We believe  
not by  
Obiects but  
by our inte-  
rior Acts,

7. In this Matter then as in all others, we are exactly to attend to the Proposal of Obiects, for as they are laid forth to vs, so much weight they haue. For example. A real Good in it Self is by mistake Proposed to me as an Euil, I adhere to that Object as it is proposed, and must Adhere to Euil, because it appears so to me. In like manner, an infallible Truth, is Proposed not as it is in it Self, *infallible*, But discoloured, and defaced, by a viciated Proposition which is fallible; Therefore by force of that weak Declaration it appears no other to me but weak and fallible: And none on earth can vnbeguile me, or propose it with greater certainty, Because all are now Supposed fallible in their Teaching.

As things  
are proposed  
so they are  
to all that  
believe.

8. One Instance may yet clear my meaning. The Protestant reads Christs Sacred words. *Matt. 26. This is my Body.* And proposes what he conceiues to be believable by Faith, But doth it fallibly. Imagin that the Roman Catholick Church also could say no more for Her Doctrin, or the Sense of those Words, But as the Protestant doth so fallibly that all might be False, it is clear That none, whether Catholick or Protestant, can haue Certainty of the Doctrin, which Christ our Lord deliuered in that one short Sentence. Why? Both declare their fallible Sentiments only and *fallibly* concerning the Sacrament, So far their teaching reaches and not farther. Therefore the Faith which

An Instance

H h h 2

should

428 Disc. 7. C. 16. *The Roman Catholick Church*

should be had of the Mystery dwindles into nothing but into à fallible Opinion, by virtue of that imperfect Teaching.

*Scripture  
alone makes  
no man in-  
fallible. And  
why?*

9. Hence we learn, that à Doctrin though infallible in Gods word without more Help, makes no man (though he be à Prodigy of wit) an Infallible Teacher. The reason is. Infallibility Proceed's not from Scripture *easily* misinterpreted, but immediately from Gods special Assistance, And this Assistance which fixes an Assumed Oracle vpon Truth *unerrably*, no malice can wren to falshood. Now that the Book of Scripture as dayly Experience teaches, is horridly peruered to à Sinister sense, needs no proof, For all know, what ruin Hereticks haue (to the uttermost of their Power) endeououred to make of the chief Articles of our Christian Faith, though they acknowledged Scripture to be God's Diuine Word. There is scarce One which remain's Vperuered. Some Deny the Necessity of *Diuine Grace*, Others, that great Mystery of the *Incarnation*, Others an *Equality in the Diuine Persons*, Others our Sauours two Wills, Diuine, and Humane. Thus the Pelagians, the Antitrinitarians the Apollinarians and Monothelits taught and deceiued The world. And when Scripture is Alleged in behalf of euery Orthodox Truth, All you haue from them is à return of ouerthwart Glosses. *Grace*, must signify what the Pelagians please, *The Word made Fleh*, what the Antitrinitarians fancy, and so of the rest. Whence it is Euident that Scripture *Alone* without more light, clears not sufficiently its own Truths, For here you Se the most Primary Atticles disowned and Consequently Scripture abused by Priuate spirits, which therefore makes none infallibly certain of Gods reuealed Doctrin.

*How abused.*

*What Ca-  
tholicks re-  
quire besides  
the bare  
Letter of  
Scripture.*

10. We Catholicks require à further Help, One faithful Oracle to teach, which in this contest about the sense of Gods Word end's all. Strife, and saies both plainly and infallibly. *Thus and thus an Infinite Verity speaks in Scripture*: Yet sectaries are offended with vs, becaufe we can asser without hesitancy. *Vs believe infallibly what Truth it selfe Reueals infallibly*: Nay more, They are angry with God for hauing done them the greatest

*faucour*

more Imaginable. For to put à Period to these endles  
 debates raised among Christians, To teach all Infallibly by  
 his own vncerring Oracle what may and ought to be belieued  
 Infallibly, is à signal Mercy for which due Thanks can neuer  
 be rendered. Disowne the Mercy, we liue and shall liue, in  
 à Spirit of Contention to the worlds end.

*A signal  
 Mercy of  
 God makes  
 scissaries  
 offended.*

11. Now if you Ask why the Church, after She has pro-  
 posed the Sense and verity of Scripture, more easily beget's  
 infallible Faith in Her Children, Than the bare letter of  
 Gods word can doe without Her? I Answer. The facility (Di-  
 vine assistance Supposed) arises from the Clarity of Her tea-  
 ching known to all Vniuersally, whether Orthodox or others.  
 Whence it is, that few of our Aduersaries scarce moue any  
 doubt concerning the Sense of the Churches vniuersal receiued  
 Doctrin (for that's plain) but chiefly Question the Truth of  
 it. Whereas all is contrary in our contest with the forenamed  
 Hereticks, For there is no Dispute whether Scripture be true,  
 The debate only being what it Saith, or what the Sense of  
 Gods sacred word is? Here we fight in darkness before the  
 Church Speak's and Declares Her Sense, And if She be di-  
 uinely Assisted to teach truth, as is already and shall be more  
 amply proued in the sequele Discourse, that doubt also ceases,  
 and vanishes into nothing.

*What is  
 chiefly  
 debated  
 with Scis-  
 matics.*

12. In the mean while, Some may Object. 1. The greatest  
 part of Christian Doctrin is now agreed on, and Supposed  
 by Catholicks and Protestants both true and infallible, what  
 necessary then haue we of any other Oracle besides Scripture,  
 to teach infallibly? Answ. The Agreement is Null, and the  
 Supposition destroies it self, if all that taught Christian Doctrin  
 since the Apostles time teach it fallibly, For How could any  
 agree in this, That such and such à Doctrin is both true  
 and infallible, when He, or They (yea all) that teach may,  
 because fallible, erre in their very teaching, and call that in-  
 fallible Doctrin, without Assurance giuen of its Infallibility?  
 Do Therefore all own the Verities in Scripture infallible (not

*An Objection  
 Answered.*

H h h 3

*infallible*



*The Sectaries  
Supposition  
destroys it  
selfe.*

infallible *ex Terminis*) We must ioyntly own with that, an Oracle which Proposes these Verities *infallibly*, or can belieue nothing. And by this you Se the Supposition destroys it Selfe, For to Suppose à Doctrin infallible, when none can Propose it answerably to its Merit, as *infallible*, or *infallibly*, is as implicatory, as to Suppose without Proof, the Stars in Heauen equal in number, and from thence to Inferred they are to be iudged equal. The Parity holds exactly.

*Another  
Error of  
Sectaries.*

13. Obiect. 2. Whoever, though fallible, Defines by chance Infallible Christian Doctrin, Teaches the very sence that Christ taught. Answ.: Very true. But he giues no Assurance That he doth so, For à fallible Deliuery of à Truth, as yet only Supposed not Proued infallible, raises it no higher but to such à State of Vncertainty, that one may iustly doubt whether it be Christ's infallible Doctrin or no.

*Sectaries  
clearly con-  
vinced.*

14. Obiect. 3. The fallible teaching of an infallible Verity may well conuey vnto à Hearer that which God has Reuealed. For why may not an infallible Verity, as *Reuealed*, though *fallibly Proposed* haue influence vpon Faith, and work in Belieuen à most firm Assent? Answ. It is vtterly vmpossible; For à fallible teaching of an infallible Verity not yet Proposed as infallible by any, neither Supposes the Truth *Certain* vpon *other principles* (and this is euer to be noted) *nor makes it infallible*. It Supposes no Truth *taught* infallibly, for Protestants Say None now can teach so, All Doctors being fallible: And most evidently it makes not that Verity infallible, For *the Verity* (as reuealed) *was antecedently Infallible before this fallible teaching mixed with it*, Which therefore can not make it Infallible. By what is said, you se our Sectaries Supposition of some Christian Doctrin acknowledged infallible is pure Sophistry, for none can Assure them so much, if All that teach it be fallible. The very Apostolical Doctrin respectiue to vs now liuing loses its Infallibility, if this Supposition stands, That all Teachers are fallible. Now we Proceed to à Second Argument and Discourse thus.

15. If the whole Church (the like is of any General approved Council) can err, She may not only traitorously betray Her Trust, But moreouer doe so much Mischief to Christians by uniting all in Errour, That they must remain in it, without redress or remedy, For if the Church may mistake, whilst She Teaches, No man on earth can be rationally Supposed wiser than She is, nor goe about to Vnbeguile the deceived by Her. The Evil here hinted at is so Notoriously horrid, the Perplexity it causes so Great, that either Church Doctrin vnauoydably becomes despicable, (whilst euery one may iustly Quarrel with it) Or this Principle must stand vnshaken, that the Church cannot teach a Falshood.

*The Church  
does Infalli-  
bly further  
proue it.*

16. Some Sectaries seeing the Force of this vnanswerable Argument, hold the Church Diffusive infallible in fundamentals, Yet neither name nor can name those Christians who constitute an infallible Church larger than the Roman, whereof enough is said both in this, and the other Treatise. In the next place their whole Strife is to Oppose the Infallibility of the Churches Representatiues in her General Councils, But methinks inconsequently, For what euer Reason proues Immunity from Errour in that diffused Moral Body, Conuinces as forcibly the like Priviledge in its Representatiues, Which are not Conuened to deceive, But to teach God's reuealed Verities

*Sectaries  
Oppose The  
Infallibility  
of Councils,  
without  
reason.*

17. Mr. Stillingfleet. Part. 3. C. 1. 2. P. 506. After a larger Prologue to very little Substance, Tells vs. *It is not any high challenge of Infallibility, in any Person, or council. Which must put an end to Controversies; For nothing but Truth and Reason, can ever do it, and the more men pretend to vnreasonable Ways of deciding them, instead of ending One, they beget many. I say contrary.* If the Church and Her Councils be infallible, Controversies are ended without more Adoe, For all know vpon that Supposition, What to belieue and what to reiect. And if they be not Owned infallible, there is no such thing or things in being as Truth, and Reason, which can put an end to Controversies. To complicate the Assertion is to proue it.

18. Doe

*The Infalli-  
bility of  
Councils  
asserted.*

18. Doe then no more but cast away all thought of an infallible Church, as also of Her infallible Councils. It is clear, that every Doctrin Taught since the Apostles time has been deliuered *Fallibly*, Tis clear likewise, All that teach it at this day (highly dissenting among them selues) Teach fallibly, Imagin now that two aduerse Parties, Ten learned Protestants on the one Side, And as many learned Catholicks on the Other, meet together and seriously Discuss this Point, whether Protestancy or Catholick Doctrin (as opposed to Protestancy) be the true Religion? (the like is if any particular Controuersy fall vnder Debate.) I say the Attempt to decide any one controuerted matter is Vain and Impossible, if both Church and Councils be Supposed fallible, And consequently Mr. Stillingfleets *Truth* and *Reason* are no more but meer insignificant Words. The Reason is. Whilst fallible men plead for Religion vpon Principles as fallible as they are that Argue, the Result of that Dispute necessarily carried on by Arguments and reasoning purely fallible, can end in nothing but in dissatisfactory Topicks, if yet it come so far. But this is so, and obserue well. The Protestant pleads for his Tenents, or oppugn's our Doctrin and doth it fallibly: The Catholick Answers, and fallibly too; The Protestant Replies, but hath no infallible Principle to ground his Reply vpon, no more hath the Catholick, if the Supposition hold's, any other Answer but what's Vngrounded, and Fallible. Say I beseech you, do not both Parties, busied in this Contest vpon vncertainties, run on in Darkness? Haue we yet the least hope of Satisfaction? Or so much as the Truth we all seek for yet discovered in this weak skirmish, Whilst Fallible men, and Fallible Arguments, and Fallible Principles are the only Support of the whole Discourse? Most evidently no. All are left where they were before in a deep Perplexity.

*The weakness  
of two par-  
ties pleading  
fallibly.*

19. I Said iust now, If we *exclude an Infallible Church*, and her approued Councils, *Truth* and *Reason* vanish to nothing, and that no Principle remain's whereby these Contexts of Religion can be ended. To proue the Assertion further. I first vnge

the

the Protestant to name the last certain Principle, or that vltimate Judge in whose Sentence he dare Acquiesce, and Say positively upon this Principle we must both rely, This shall Define whether you my *Adversary*, or I *yours*, defend Truth. The man will not for stark shame name Himself nor any priuate Person on earth for Judge: He cannot recurr to an Inferiour Council and Oppose that, against One Generally receiued the Whole world ouer: He will not adhere to a Schismatical and Heretical Church, and plead by Her in defence of his Doctrin, against an Oracle neuer yet taxed or tainted of Errour, Or if he doth so, he gain's nothing, For all those are as fallible as the two Parties now in contest. Where then is the Sectaries Sure Principle, or last Iudge to stand to in these Debates? Or whither will he goe to find out his yet Vndiscouered *Truth* and *Reason*? Will his refuge be to Scripture? It help's nothing in this Case, not only because Scripture omit's to speak either explicitly of the half of such Controuersies as are now agitated, But vpon this Account Chiefly, That if the Church and Councils be fallible, the Book it self becomes a most fallible Principle to all, For neither Catholics nor Protestants, nor Arians, nor any, can Say with Assurance, such and such is the vndoubted sense of Gods word in Controuerted Matters, if the Churches Iudgement be set light by, and look't on as fallible. Yet I'll Say thus much. Were the Church fallible, Sectaries may well blush, first to decry Her Sense of Scripture, and then to set vp the far inferiour and fallible interpretation of euery single Person against the Church?

20. Some may Reply. The grand Principle of Protestants, is, that Scripture in things necessary to Saluation, appeares plain to all who vse ordinary Diligence to vnderstand it, wherein certainly their *Truth* and *Reason* may be found. Contra. And I Pres not in this place the Vncertainty of the Principle, which is as disputable as any other Protestant Tener, But Say more, it is wholly improbable, Yea and destroies Protestantcy. It is improbable, Because it cannot be supposed that any priuate man or men, haue vsed full Diligence to vnderstand the Scriptures Sen-

Iii

*Sectaries are  
urged to name the last  
Iudge in these  
Debates,*

*And cannot  
pitch on any.*

*The grand  
Principle of  
Protestants,  
reueled,*

*And why?*

ic,

#### 4.4 Disc. 2. C. 16. *The Roman Catholick Church*

se, And that à Church of à thousand years standing hath neglected à Duty so necessary. But these priuate men whether Arians, Protestants, or Socinians, and the Church draw contradictory Senses from Scripture, And all these iarring Sectaries with their different Senses defend not truth, Therefore some of them (let the fault yet light where you will) haue not vsed Diligence, nor rightly vnderstood God's word. The Question now is (and some Oracle must decide it) where, or in whom; this Misunderstanding lies? Most willingly would I haue this one Difficulty solued and t'is worth the Labour, whilst euery one Sees it is no more certain, that the Protestant hitt's on the Scriptures true Sense, *than it is certain that the whole Church after à thousand years Diligence, mistakes it.* Can this think ye be euer cleared in behalf of Protestants by any proof, so much as meanly probable? It is Impossible. Wherefore I Conclude, Their Grand principle is rotten at the very root, fail's all that Rely on it. I will say it once more. If the Protestant hath no greater Certainty of his Sense of Scripture than it is certain, That he hitt's right, and the Church Err's in her Sense, His Belief after all industry vsed stands vnprincipled, rests on his own fancy, and is not resistible, *while he iudges so.* Say the very vtmost it is no more but à meer hazard, whether he belieues, or no, and this destroies Protestancy. Thus much of Scripture.

*Why Should  
Sectaries his  
rights on the  
Scriptures  
Sensu.*

*And the  
Church be  
deluded?*

21. The next thing pleadable in behalf of Mr Stillingfleets *Truth* and *Reason*, may perhaps be the Authority of Holy Fathers. It is weightles if the Church be fallible, or has Erred. And first Protestants say all Fathers are liable to Errour. I add more and Assert, if that Church whereof They were Members taught or can teach false Doctrin, it is à meer vanity to seek for certain *Truth*, or any satisfactory *Reason* in the Fathers Writings. What can Streams (the Fathers were no other) be Supposed pure, and the Head fountain (Gods own Oracle) Poysoned and infected? Did they hit right vpon our Christian Verities, when their only Guide (Christ's sacred Spouse) misled Posterity? Could they Dedicate all their Labours to make an Oracle renowned, thus  
afterward

*The Sallies  
pretence  
to Fathers  
improbable*

forward whispered Errours into all mens ears? These are Paradoxes. I Say then, it is à stronger and far more reasonable Principle to Assert, That the Church neuer erred nor can erre, Than first to Suppose Her erroneous, And next to find truth in the Fathers, who were no more but Schollers, and suck't the milk of purest Doctrin from the Brests of this their Mother, *The Catholick Church*; If She therefore poysoned them with fals learning, both She and They yet poyson vs; And consequently neither the Church, nor Fathers deserue credit, nor can be prodently Belieued.

21. And here by the way I cannot but reflect vpon à strange Procedure, vsual with Sectaries in All their Polemicks. First they Suppose the Church and Councils errable, yea actually misled in Asserting *Purgatory, Transubstantiation &c.* And to Rectify what is thought Amis, Some few Gleaning of Fathers (how little to the purpose is seen aboue) are produced, and these, Forsooth, must stand as it were in battail Array, fight against à whole Church, and ouerthrow Her Errours. Is this, think ye Reasonable? Can it be imagined that God preferued his Reuealed truths in the Hearts thoughts, and words, of à few Fathers, and suffered his Vniuersal Church, with so many learned Councils (conuened after the *Four First*) to fall presently into so shameful à Dotage, as Sectaries charge vpon Her? Were the Fathers then illuminated, and was the Church afterward darkened and befoted? There is none so blind, But must needs se Himselfe out of Countenance by aduenturing to Defend à Tenet so highly Contrary to all Reason. Wherefore I must earnestly petition the Reader once more to reflect vpon the greatest Folly which, Methinks, euer entred the Thoughts of men. Thus it is. The primitive Fathers, (not many in number) Who wrote in the First three or four Centuries in different Times and Places, (perused by few and vnderstood by Fewer) are Supposed to Deliuer exactly the Catholick Verities, (What They sayd was True) And an Ample Vniuersal Church together with Her Learned Councils known to All; spread the whole world ouer for à Thou-

*The procedure of Sectaries, unreasonable.*

*To say the Fathers taught truth, and that the Church do. ferred Truth*



436 Disc. 2. C. 16 *The Roman Catholick Church*

*Is worse  
then a Pa-  
radox.*

land yeares and vpward, must be Supposed so Abominably sinful, so Fearfully mislead, as to Desert the Ancient Faith of Those Fathers, to Peruert Gods Truths, And Finally to Bring into the Vast Moral Body of Christians à Vniuersal Mischiefe, à Deluge of Errour, of Idolatry, And no man knowes what. If this be not pure Phrensy, there was neuer any.

23. The last Principle to ground *Truth* and *Reason* vpon, or to bring Controuersies to an end, is Vniuersal Tradition, but this also Fail's to vphold Truth, if the Church be fallible: For who will, or can with certainty trust the Tradition of à Church (or so much as take the Book of Scripture from Her) were she branded with this foul Note of hauing Publickly taught, and wilfully imposed à hundred Doctrins vpon Christians contrary to Gods reuealed Reuealed Truths. But more of this about C. 5. 6.

*Clear Infe-  
rences  
against  
Sectaries.*

24. After all you se first, *Truth* and *Reason* brought to Ruin, Faith and Religion vnHINGED, if the Church and Councils be Fallible. You se. 2. These Inferences Setled vpon vndeniable Principles. *The Church is infallible. Ergo Controuersies are without Perplexity ended.* Contrarywise. *The Church is Fallible: Ergo Contentions goe on without Redress, endlessly.* Scripture as you haue heard because differently Sensed decides nothing, No more do the Fathers (Say Sectaries) confessedly fallible. Church, and Councils are reiectcd as errable when and as often as Sectaries please, Those that Dispute of Religion (Yet more Fallible) are not to be Iudges in their own Cause, and without à Iudge Their best Arguments will be thought by all Prudent men, no more but Vnconcluding Topicks, And really they neither are, nor can be better for want of Principles, and some Oracle Infallible.

25. Whoouer desires to haue the Principle I Rely on further established by clear Inferences drawn from our Aduersaries, needs only to read M. stillingfleet from page. 534. to the end of that 2. Chapter. My Principle is. There is no possibility of ending strife touching Religion if the Church and Councils be fallible,

Mr. Stillingfleet and his Lord, Say they must have some end, or They'll tear the Church à sunder. My Task then is to show that these mens Doctrin Tears all in pieces, and makes Controuersies Endles.

26. *The Determination of à Council erring* (say our Aduersaries) *is to stand in force and to haue external Obedience at least yielded to it, till Euidence of Scripture, or à Demonstration to the Contrary, make the Error appear, and vntill thereupon, another Council of equal Authority, reuerse the Error.* Here is their Position, which breed's nothing but Confusion among Christians, and licenseth euery impetuous Spirit, interiourly at least, to Censure Church Doctrin as abominable if He iudges it Erroneous, or Contrary to Christ's Verities. I say *Interiourly*? And 'Tis hard to Silence and oblige men to external Obedience, if this full Perswasion remain's fixed in their minds. *Gods truths are Ouerthrowen, by an Erring Church, or à mislead Council.* There is no law humane or Diuine which can bind to Hypocrisy; But to iudge one thing Euidently fals, and to Profess it as true is pain Hypocrisy, To make therefore this Sin all are in points of faith not to Speak Contrary to Truth, or hostility will of Necessity follow Between the Profession of priuate men and their interiour Iudgements, which cannot but foment Rebellion in the Church whilst People generally liue in such à Perswasion that God's Truths are wronged.

27. But here is not my greatest Exception. Please to mark those other words. *Till Euidence of Scripture, or à Demonstration makes the Error appear: Or, another Council reuerse the Error of the Former,* And say I beseech you, to whom must the Euidence of Scripture appear? To whom must the Councils Error be Demonstrable? What to Priuate men, and these Fallible? If so; the Contest will be whether these Priuate Erring men or the Supposed Erring Council, has the greater Euidence of Scripture, Or on which Side the Demonstration against the Error lies? I say if the Church and Councils be fallible, There neither is, nor can be any thing like Euidence

*The Sectaries Doctrin breed's Confusion.*

*And necessarily brings in Division.*

*It can not be said to whom the supposed Errors of*

*Councils  
must appear.*

or a Demonstration in either of the Contenders, Therefore an endles Dispute vpon meer Vncertainties must ensue, unless Mr. Stillingfleet laies, the Errour vpon whom he pleases, and makes Himself Vmpire in the cause. You will say he supposes the Councils Errours evidently known. Pitiful. To whom I beseech you must they be known? Its impossible to return an Answer. Again if Suppositions may once pass for Proofs, I'll goe the Contrary way, and either Suppose all Councils infallible (or maintain this Truth: *Errours cannot be evidently known*) And why should not my Supposition, be as good as his? What then remain's but that we bring these Suppositions to the Test, and Examine which is better? And here the Dispute begins again in behalf of what is Supposed, which can neuer be ended without an infallible Iudge.

*Sedition  
reign's if  
Councils be  
fallible.*

28. It may be replied. These Aduersaries proue not Councils fallible vpon any bare Supposition, but only Say thus much: If they were Fallible, the Peace of the Church may yet be Preferued. Contra 1. Peace is infinitely better vpheld were Councils (as they truly are) owned Infallible, For so euery one would Acquiesce in their Decrees, as the Christian world has done hitherto. Contra 2. The Churches Peace is torn in pieces, Sedition necessarily reign's, Debates are endles, if Councils be fallible. To proue this.

*One Proof of  
the Assertion*

29. Call once more to mind the Assertion. Viz. *The Determination of an erring Council is to stand in force, until there vpon, an other Council of equal Authority Reverse the Errour.* Obserue I beseech you. Both these Councils are Supposed fallible, and of equal Authority. The Second therefore cannot reverse the Errour of the First, being as weak, as fallible, and of no more Authority than That first was. Or if thus by Turns one may Annul the Decrees of the other, A third may be conuened which recall's the Decrees of both, and a Fourth which Cashes all the precedent Definitions, And so in *Infinitem* without Stop or Stint. Hence arise endles Quarrels, not only between Council, and Council (For euery one will Stand for its own Right)

But

Be also among Christians, Who seeing the Discord are thrown into a remediless Perplexity, and can neuer know what to Believe, or whom to Obey. You will see clearly what I would express by one or two Instances. The Nicene Council Defined the *Consubstantiality* of the Son to his Eternal Father. So much is undoubted. Imagin now, that an other like Assembly as fallible as the Nicene (for that with Sectaries was fallible) and of equal Authority, had Defined the quite Contrary Doctrin, And let this be also supposed (for in Protestant Principles is is supposable) that this Second corrected the Error of the First. What tumults think'ye, what an endles Rebellion would have ensued there vpon in Christendom, had the One Council thus clashed with the other? No man in Prudence, could haue Belieued or Obeyed either, because both are Supposed fallible, and of equal Authority.

*Further declared by an Instance.*

30. There is yet one Instance more Seitable to a Sectarian Humour. Imagin only, another Council Conuened, as Learned, as General, and as fallible as Protestants Suppose the Council of Trent to haue been, And that this reueries all the Doctrin contained in the Tridentine, Offensiuē to our Nouellists. Would not this destroy the Vnity of the present Church? Would not some Side with the first, some with the second, or rather would not All (vpon the Supposition) scorn and contemn the Authority of both Church and Councils? The like Inconuenience followes, were the Catholick Church as large as some Sectaries make it, or embraced all called Christians, If in that case Two Councils representing the whole Moral Body should meet, and the later Tear in pieces the Decrees of the former, Would not Dissensions Grow as high, and as odious vpon these Voicing and Vnuoicing Councils, as they are now in England whilst Prelates Preach One kind of Doctrin, and Fanaticks another quite contrary? And is it possible, Do all Eyes see the Horrors of this contrary Preaching in One Island; and are they shut vpon a greater more Terrible, were it true, That two of the highest Tribunals in the Church could stand in open Hostility, and

*Another Instance Shewing.*

*The horrid Inconuenience of larring Councils.*

and the One band against the other? Thus much of Diffusions and Tumults, necessary Appendants to iarring Representations.

*Sectaries will  
destroy their  
own Principles.*

31. But all is not yet Satisfyed. Our Aduersaries Say, There can be no cause of Tumults in the Church, if an Error be evidently Discouered, For euery One ought to thank God (not to grumble) when they se themselues freed from so great a Mischief: On the other side, if the Error be not Euidens, All are to submit to the Councils until a Publick Declaration makes the contrary truth manifest, And thus the Peace of Christendom seems well secured. Answ. And we will first begin with these last words. If the Error be not Euidens or intolerable, all are obliged to submit to the Council until some publick declaration &c. Hence I Argue. But there neither is, nor ever was any Euidence of Error produced against one of our Catholick Councils ( the *Lateran*, *Florantine*, or *Tridentine* for example ) there neither is, nor ever was, any Legal Declaration more against these, than against the First most ancient and purest Councils in Gods Church, Therefore Sectaries by their own Principle are obliged to Submit to the *Lateran*, *Florantine*, and *Tridentine*, as well as to others. That there has not been any Publick Legal Declaration made against them is manifest, And here is my proof.

*The Assertion  
proved*

*Clamours,  
no Proofs.*

32. The clamours and Calumnies of Arians Cast vpon the Nicene Council were no Legal Declaration against *That*, but most Vncanonical, Ergo the clamours and calumnies of Protestants cast vpon the now named *Representatives* are fully as Illegal and Vncanonical, yea and more forceles (if more can be) to Declare them Inualid, And besides clamours, we neuer yet had, nor shall haue hereafter any Thing from Sectaries. The true Reason is. Go groundedly to work, There is not one Imaginable Principle whereby the *Nicene* can be proued a more lawfull Council then the great Council of *Lateran* was, so much decryed by Nouellists: And if it were Possible ( as it is not ) to Ouertrow the One by any solid proof, the Other *Ex ipso* loses all Credit and Authority.

Hence These and the-like calumnies vented by Sectaries in Councils. The Lateran and Tridentine were unlawful Councils, ordered by the Pope, they had not freedom. Their Votes ought to be without surreptions. The Councils were not men of unquestionable Integrity. Some few by fair Pretences brought over the greater number wanting judgement, to side with their Designs &c. Such corner-Calumnies I say, and I read them in our Aduersaries (As easily cleared out by Arians against the Nicene Fathers) can neuer pass as legal Declarations against Catholick Councils, whilst euery Proposition want's proof, and euery word its due Weight: That what euer can be said to this Sense stand's Vnprincipled. Therefore unless all must be iust so as Sectaries will haue it; Unless the Suppositions become conuincing Arguments, and a pure begging the Question proue it, Or be able to decide our Differences, We haue Right to cry as loud They. *Audiat & altera Pars.* Let Catholicks be heard also. And when they are heard and return their Answers before a lawful Iudge to euery particular, these Calumnies will vanish, or rather appear like Themselues, forged and far-fetch't Improbabilities. Exclude a Iudge and a iust Sentence, Sectaries are where they would be in the old Labyrinth of Quarrelling without Principles, or giuing any hope of ending One Question in Controuersy.

Now to implead our Councils of Errours? and to present Evidence for it, is more than a desperate Attempt, vnless as I say the Corner-votes of a few iarring dispersed Sectaries (neuer legally Assembled) haue Power to create a new kind of Evidence unknown to the world. Please to reflect a little. It must, forsooth, be Evident That the Doctrin of *Transubstantiation*, or *Trinity of Saints* are Errours, whilst a whole vnited learned Church Opposes these vain Pretences and Defend's the Articles as Catholick Verities. It was neuer yet heard, that Sectaries Scattered here an there had Authority to impose such foule disgraceful Names of *Evident Errours*, or *Errours morally Certain* vpon Doctrines so vniuersally receiued, when as I say The most learned Body of Christians that euer was, Vnuotes all they blow into the

K k k

eares

*The Arians  
and Pro-  
stants Cla-  
mour and  
Calumnies  
alike.*

*A Iudge is  
to decide all,  
and not  
Clamour.*

*Sectaries  
neuer legally  
assembled.*

*Creates a  
new Kind  
of Evidence.*



442 Disc. 2. C. 16. The Roman Catholick Church &c.

cares of others, as meer Impertinences. Evidence, Good Reader, and Moral certainty lose force and neuer yet stood in the Sight or presence of so strong an Opposition. I will yet say more. Though we abstract from Church Authority, we Catholicks are able to maintain our Doctrine against Sectaries upon Tradition, the Authority of Fathers, ancient Records &c. But still we require A last Judge to give Sentence, whether they or we abuse the Principles we plead by (For certainly the one or other Party doth so) But this, Nonellists ever Decline and will haue vs to Dispute without either Judge or Indubitable Principles, and so make, as is now said, all Controversies endless, which indeed is the only Thing they aime at, and I haue undertaken to proue against them.

*Sectaries decline both Judge and final Sentence.*

35. Mr Stillingfleet. P. 539. speak's so fully to my purpose that more cannot be desired from an Adversary. He Demands, how it can be known when Errors in Councils or the Church are manifest or intolerable, and when not? And Answers thus. We appeal to Scripture interpreted by the Concurrent Sense of the primitive Church, the common reason of mankind, the consent of wise and learned men, supposing Scripture to be the Rule of Faith. And a little after. If you Ask further. Who shall be Judge what a necessary Reason of Demonstration is? His Lordship tell's you plainly enough from Hooker. It is such as being Propos'd to any man and understood, the mind cannot chuse but inwardly assent to it. Here you haue the Gentlemans last Principles: And every one when applied to our present Matter is as much Controuerted between Catholicks and Protestants, as the very Question now in Dispute. Observe well.

*Our Adversaries Decline.*

36. The Question is whether the Lateran, Florentine, and Tridentine Councils haue erred in their Definitions (the like may be moued of all others) Protestants say, they haue erred: Catholicks Deny it. Both Parties Appeal to Scripture interpreted by the Sense of the Primitive Church So far as that Oracle learns it. And if any Passage be found there seemingly fauorable to Sectaries, Catholicks after the Contest of one whole Age haue been more ready to clear all Doubts, To take of any thing like

*Lead's still on to dispute, but to make no end of Controversies.*

Imagined

imagined Errors, Than Protestants were ever yet able to lay  
 such foul Aspersions vpon either Church, or Councils. What  
 then is to be done? Must we eternally Dispute concerning  
 this Sense and end nothing? Must we Commence new Quarrels  
 about Matters so often debated? Must the old *Actum agere* come  
 over and over again? Sectaries like that Sport well, but no Pro-  
 gress is made this way. As yet we only skirmish in the dark.  
 Wherefore recourse at last is to be had to a lawful Iudge to so-  
 me known Oracle or other, in whose final Sentence all are to  
 acquiesce. If any lawful Iudge, or owned Oracle (Primitive or  
 later) Condemn our Councils of Errour, and we licence Secta-  
 ries to name either ( Provided they make not Themselves Iudges,  
 nor their long since defeated Arguments Evidences ) We are in-  
 debted the guilty Persons, and They the wise Reformers, But if All  
 of us Decline this last Iudicature, and do nothing but hear our  
 sides talk vpon Principles grossly misinterpreted, by the one or  
 other Party, Dissentions will goe on remedilessly to the great  
 scandal of Iewes and Gentils, and controuersies of Religion  
 cannot but proue endles.

*Sectaries  
 who began  
 the quarrel.*

*Like well to  
 hear them-  
 selves talk  
 without  
 Principles,*

## CHAP. XVII.

*More of this subiect. A further Search made into Errours  
 called intolerable. Whether the Roman Catholick  
 Church must be supposed by Sectaries to haue alrea-  
 dy Committed intolerable Errours, Or only, whe-  
 ther She may for the future Err Intolerably?  
 The Doctrin of Protestants proued False,  
 And Most inconsequent.*

**M**R Stillingfleet to find out Euident and intolerable  
 Errours in Councils Appeal's (as you Se) in the  
 K k k 2 next

*A Dilemma*

*Or a clear  
Commission  
of Pro-  
fanes,*

next place to the *Common Reason of mankind*, and is the *Consent of wise and learned men*. None could have more ruined his own cause, For this Dilemma is vnanswerable. The forementioned Councils haue either erred intolerably in Defining the Doctrins of *Transubstantiation*, and of *Purgatory*, Or haue not erred intolerably. If not; Protestants, as is now said, are obliged by their own Law to yeild at least external Obedience to them, which is not done, For herein they haue made a Publick Reformation, and call such Doctrins Errours. On the other side, if these Errours be intolerable you se by their own words, We must haue the *Common Reason of mankind*, the Consent also of wise and learned men both ready to Oppose and Condemn them: But this is enormously improbable vpon a clear Ground. Do no more but Deuide the Moral Body of Christians now at Debate into two Classes, *Catholicks* and *Protestants*, For one or the other makes these Councils Illegal or their Doctrins intolerable, you haue hundreds, yea I think thousands, who auouch the Contrary, and clear *Both* from that vnworthy Imputation. Therefore vnlesse Protestants engross the Gift of *common Reason* and *Wisdom* to themselves, and allow no little parcel of it either to the Greek or Latin Church, They are to recal what is Said: And if they will haue Reason so fast intailed vpon a few Sectaries, That no body els can share in it, There is no further Dispute: All we say is. *God help Them.*

*A Princi-  
ple ill ap-  
plied,*

2. But what say we to Mr Hooker who tells us necessary Reason or a Demonstration is that, *which being proposed to any man and vnderstood, The mind cannot chuse but inwardly Assent to it.* I answer, the Principle, though good, is most imperitiously Applied to the controuersy now in hand, For haue not we (As already noted) Thousands and Thousands in the Roman Church most learned and pious, who hear the Doctrins of the fore named Councils proposed, and in Iudgement so inwardly Assent to all without scruple, that they would dye for the verities there defined? The Truth is manifest. Therefore Mr Hookers necessary Reason, or Demonstration has no place in these far

more

more numerous than all the Protestants are in England, and consequently every man stands not evidently convicted of our Councils Errours. Now if you say so many Thousands are fools, Know Sr, That no few of these fools, are wise enough to dispute with you, and to Show you Speak at random without Principles.

3. Thus much is said of our Catholick Councils hitherto convened in the Church, now if we return to the old Supposition, and First imagin all Councils fallible, and Secondly thinking that the latter, of equal Authority amends the First, or à Third the Errours of the Second, and so in *Infinitum*, I Say it is impossible, either clearly to Discover the pretended Errours, or to redress them, and this I Assert vpon these grounds.

*An Assertion proved.*

4. One already hinted at, is, that none can by an inward Assent (and Mr Hooker requires that) own any such Evidences which the Council which makes them Errours, is as weak and fallible as the other was that Defined the contrary, and published all vnder the Notion of Christian Truths. No more can I, were I yet to Learn rest Satisfyed, in what either of these two jarring Councils Define (for the One is as bad as the Other) than I am able to trust to two Ministers Talk, if I heard them Preach quite contrary Doctrin at Pauls Church, That is, no man can believe either, vpon their fallible Authority. This Principle therefore Stands firm. *An errable Council is a sign to Teach, or Vnteach another likewise Erring, in the high and yet unknown Mysteries of Faith*, as One Wholly ignorant, of an vnknown Path, is to direct à Stranger into it, For as Both desire to learn the way from à third Guide more skilful, So both these Councils must take their Instructions from some third certain Oracle, Or remain, as they are, Ignorant. But Sectaries remit none to any liuing certain Oracle, Therefore they cannot but still Sit in Darknes (Tis Gods iust Iudgement vpon them) and blind as They are, lead the blind they know not whither.

*A fallible Council, most vnmeet to teach the high Mysteries of Faith.*

5. Again (and here is my second Reason) Before the Discovery

*These Sup-  
posed Errours  
in Councils.*

*Councils be  
discovered  
by larring  
Multitudes.*

*What if a  
Council be  
not in Being.*

*When diss-  
cutions arise*

*One Point  
Examined.*

couery of these intolerable Errours we ought to haue a List of them, and know How many or few they are, And who can Ascertain vs of this? Are we to diuine at their Intolerableness by our own priuate Iudgements? Or is some wiser body to instruct vs, when there is no Council at hand to do it? Must all Christians dispersed vp and down the world write letters to one another, Or inform themselues whether the Errours be intolerable? And if so, whether it be yet high time to cry out against them? Or, is it enough to Ask our next Neighbour what they think of the Business, and rest there? Perhaps some will hold them inconsiderable, Others of a violent temper hatious not longer to be born with. And can such fumbling and Confusion which teares the Vnity of the Church in pieces Preserue Her in peace think ye? Must we first Suppose a learned Council to haue erred, and next rely on vnlearned larring Multitudes to Proclaim, Censure, and Reuerse the Errour? If this way be not more than Vncanonical in matters of Religion, there was neuer any.

6. You will Say, the next Council is to mend all the failings of the former. Answ. Were this, as it is not Possible, what is to be done in the mean time, whilst there is no Council in Being? Must the Church which Belieues the Definitions of the former erring Councils and all Christians with it, Err so long till this other Council Appears? Or, is euery priuate man to resolute for himself what's best to do in such Exigences? Reflect I beseech you. How far easier were it, to quiet all, might Councils once be owned infallible. Yet here is my least Exception. I say therefore to proue what I sayd above. If Church and Councils can err notoriously, There is no means left on earth, either to discouer the Errours, or to amend them.

7. The Assertion will be proued by sifting this one Point to the Bottom. And Much light will be had if we leave Generalities, wherein Sectaries alwaies lurk, and descend to particulars, Or lay forth the nature of some imaginable Errours.

Call

Can then These if any be, horrid and intolerable.

1. To teach *there is no God, no Christ, no Redeemer, no Salvation.* Ask whether the Councils in Gods Church can err thus grossly, or are so secured by Divine Assistance, as not to Define such *Aburdities*? If it be Answered, They are so far at least *presumed* infallible, I clearly Infer, No man can exclude a total *infallibility* from Councils. If it be Answered, Possibly they may err in this Damnable manner. I infer Again. Ergo, Possibly, Councils, Church, and all Christians may utterly desert Christ, become Atheists, Turks, Jewes, Diuels, or what els you will, that naught is. Can this also be granted.

*The Name  
of horrid  
Errors.*

2. One may reply, it is indeed possible, yet will never be. *Causes.* Who hinders the Mischief, I beseech you, if the Supposition may stand? The Roman Catholick Church, Say *Sectaries*, is already Idolatrous, and long since was Antichristian, when some English Protestants made the Pope Antichrist. Why then may not *Atheism, Iudaism, and Turcism* infect likewise the Whole Moral Body of Christians, and Destroy both Church and Councils? Grant this Possible, there can be no more talk of after-Councils correcting the former, erroneous, For the Church is now Destroyed, Christ our Lord must please to appear again, or send some great Prophet to establish a new Church more firm than the other was now ruined, or we are left desolate, utterly Churchless.

*The Church  
accused of  
intolerable  
Errors.*

3. I am verily perswaded our Aduersaries will think twice at, before they once grant these horrid Consequences, and therefore must needs make the Supposed Evident intolerable *errors* not altogether so abominable, but less, or of a lower rank, *secondary and intolerable. Remember that.* And what may these be think ye? I would fain know whether any such foul Doctrine have been euer taught *de facto*, or, because Councils are Supposed fallible, whether they yet remain in a State of possibility, and only may be Taught? If it be Said they are not *now* but only possible, Or may be intolerable hereafter, And *Sectaries* upon that Account abandon the Roman Catholick Church:

*A question  
proposed to  
Sectaries.*



*Concerning  
these Suppo-  
sed Errors  
Actual or  
Possible.*

Church : Their Sin is now actual and more horrid than such Errours are, Because They desert à Church vpon supposed faults which only *may be*, yet neuer were hitherto. Now if for à meer Possibility offalsities, (neuer yet actually Discouered nor known) The Roman Church is to be quitted, Protestants ought to forsake Their own Religion, For they are all liable to Error, Yea, And may well hang vp the most Innocent man in the world vpon this score, That he may be à thiefe, Though as yet he neuer Stole any thing.

*None Con-  
demned for  
Errors  
which Possi-  
bly may be.*

11. The Errours therefore, if we Discourse rationally, hitherto pretended against vs are not in à meer State of Possibility, But *Actual*, *Euidēt*, and *intolerable*. We inquire after them, And still proceed vpon this wretched Supposition, that both Church and Council are fallible, or haue erred. When Envy has done its Vtmost, you only can get à List of these or the like Supposed Falshoods. *Praying to Saints. The Real Presence. Worshiping of Images. Transubstantiation* or some thing of this nature, which Catholicks maintaiū. Now truely, it is more than extrauagant (and I know not with what Conscience Sectaries do it) to Decry these as *Euidēt* and *intolerable* Errours, while à whole learned Church defends them as Truths.

*Sectaries in  
consequen-  
cies.*

12. What Saith Mr Hooker ? Is the mind so forced that after à full Proposal, it cannot chuse but inwardly Assent to All as euidēt Errours ? Toyes, Trifles. Millions, as we now sayd, own them as Apostolical Verities. 2. If *Euidēt* and *intolerable*, they strike at such Verities as Sectaries call the fundamentals of Faith, And consequently the Roman Church which maintains them, has been Vnorthodox in fundamentals for à thousand years and more. Will this be granted ? Grant or deny, here is an vnanswerable Dilemma ; They are fundamental Errours (in our Sectaries sēse) destructive of Diuine Faith, or not. If not ; but only smaller matters, Protestants Oblige themselves to forbear, and to expect the Churches Good pleasure vntil, some other Council meet's, and Reuerses what's Amis. Their Clamours therefore against the Churches Doctrin now,

authorised and most illegal by their own Principles. Nor have they Power, as is confessed, to Reform themselves in lesser matters, but only in things of a higher Concern; *Enslaves*, and

1. Now if they be of this nature and consequently fundamental Absurdities against Faith, It follows, that there was no Church right in fundamentals the whole world over for an Age before Luther: Not the Roman; if the Supposition holds, Nor any other Society of Christians for all those (name whom you will) were more deeply plunged into fundamental Error.

3. And 'Tis the chiefest thing I aim at. If Church and Councils be owned fallible, can err, or have erred, Our Admirers Supposition of Errors *Evident*, and *Intolerable*, is truly chimericall, And therefore I said just now, None can take them as such, (and consequently no Power on earth to amend them, I prove the Assertion.

4. First they cannot be known as evident or manifest, whose Principles as clear as the Errors are supposed to be, which therefore must be so indisputable, That the mind inevitably assents to them, as Mr. Hooker saith, and a wonder light & probability, or a mislaid Moral Certainty, brings no Evidence now. Now here we Venge our Admirers to bring a Light but one, or more clear Principles, whereby it may manifestly appear, that *Transubstantiation* or any other Catholick Doctrine, is so manifest a Falshood, That the mind convinced, and considered with the Evidence, cannot chuse but deary it as intolerable. Whither will these men run for Principles? To Scripture, it's evidently abused by the one or other Party, he who is in fault? You will say That's yet disputable, therefore far of from Evidence: Church and Councils, supposable, and erroneous, cannot tell you nor give in Evidence against him or them, that abuse Scripture. Whither now? To the Fathers? All are fallible, and their Sense in controverted matters is made so intricate when you hear them glossed by the Protestant, and unglossed by the Catholick,

*A Church in  
fidelity  
against St.  
Augustine  
and the  
Councils*

*Intolerable  
Errors can  
not be proved  
against the  
Church.*

*By any thing  
like a Prin-  
ciple.*

*Summary of  
Reasons of  
initiation*

that you would Swear they speak Contradictions, And can any thing like evidence or certainty, grow from these contrary Glasses, which as Experience teaches, breed endless Quarrels?

*Scripture,  
Church Fa-  
thers and  
all Princi-  
ples fail Sic-  
taries.*

15. Other Principles we have not any, except Mr Seilling, fleets *Common Reason of Mankind* (the worst of all) for doe we not see, that Hereticks euery where make Themselves and their own Sects most reasonable? Where we haue nothing like common Reason, but so many different and diuided Sentiments of iarring men disperfed vp and down the world. If therefore Scripture, Fathers, and this Common Reason fail to be Principles, our Sectaries Supposition of manifest or Euident falsities in the Church, goes beyond all Moderation, and implies an Ouerclashing more than intolerable.

*Vncertain  
Topics, no  
Principles.*

16. Their vngrounded Mistake lies here, That Principles are Supposed at hand, or ready at a call to Decide in this case of Councils Supposed Error, Whereas if both Church and Council can, or do Err, There are no such things in being as Principles. Topics at most, or an endles iarring vpon meer Vncertainties lead none to an Euident Discouery of Errours, Therefore I say right, they cannot be known as Euident for want of Principles; and if not known as such, no Power on earth can amend them. Yet good Principles reach thus far at least, as to Demonstrate that Protestants grossly Mistake in their Clamours against our Churches errors *de facto*, And here you haue my Principles already hinted at.

*A Strong  
Argument  
Against  
Sectaries.*

17. Either these supposed Errours are those vnchristian Tenents mentioned N. 8. And certainly Councils neuer transgressed so enormously as to Define such diuellish Doctrins. Or 2. They are only Possible false Doctrins which may be Defined if Councils can err, but yet are not taught. If So, All must Say, that as it is horrid to condemn a man for a crime he may commit, though he neuer did it, So it is the highest Injustice to condemn a whole Church for Falshood's She may teach (if fallible) though She neuer taught them. Nothing then remains but to plead against our Church Doctrin *de facto*, as evidently

intolerably Erroneous, and herein we will not spare Sectaries one whit, but Urge them, as we doe, to speak home in the cause. Their Accusation is euident, we Press them Again and again to iustify it by Proofs and Principles as euident. What will these errours be decayed as Euident and intolerable, and none but Sectaries get so much as a glimpse of the Euidence? Away with such fooleries. No man can hear them with Patience.

18. By what is said already you se, that The Doctrin of Transubstantiatiō shewes it Selfe as it is, not only false but most Inconsequēt. Mark, I beseech you the Inconsequence. These Missettles Define the Church to be an Assembly of men who Belieue and Profess the pure Word of God, But such men (had there been any such) as belieue and profess the pure Word, which is a selfe infallible, are certainly infallible if they Belieue it as selfe infallible Word. Therefore they must acknowledge an infallible Moral Body of Christians that Constitutes an infallible Church.

19. In Lieu of Doing this, They Tear all in Pieces, and First Deny the Roman Catholick Church as Errable, Yea actually erring; Next, and this Marr's their own Cause, they withall profess themselves fallible: Whereas, had any thing like consequēt Doctrin entred their Thoughts, They should at least haue made themselves infallible, being as They Say, new commissioned Doctors sent from God, to amend the Churches Errours. And belieue it their own Infallibility, had they casually laid claim to it, would as soon haue been perswaded (That's neuer) as now without Probability or any thing like a Principle, They endeavour to proue the Roman Catholick Church Fallible. But let this pass: Thus much I Assert. To tell vs on the One side, There is an Assembly of men who Belieue the infallible Word of God, And on the Other, To make all that Teach and Belieue it, Fallible, liable to False Doctrin, is not only to proceed inconsequētly, but moreover to Expose Christian Religion to the Scorn of Iewes and Gentils, yea quite to ruin Diuine Faith,

*Sectaries  
Doctrin, is  
consequēt  
and absurd  
and  
inconsequēt  
and  
absurd*

*By their own  
Principles,  
they should  
hold some  
Society of  
men infallible.*

*The contra-  
ry Doctrin  
ruins Faith,*

And finally to make vs all Scepticks, certain of nothing.  
 20. If it be replied. The, Councils, and Sectaries with them  
 are at least preserved infallible in things Called the Fundamen-  
 tals of Faith plainly revealed in Scripture, I urge them first to  
 giue in their Proofs for this half or partial Infallibility, which  
 will be more than ridiculous, if once they Appear in paper.  
 Again, if we are all infallible and secure in a few Fundamen-  
 tals plainly registred in Scripture, to what Purpose do Sectaries  
 keep a coyle about smaller Matters, called Unfundamentals,  
 Which are neither intolerable or Considerable, because Small.  
 Much less can they be Evident Errours, so long as a whole  
 Church defends them as Truths, For this Evidence cannot be  
 faile Sectaries (or come to nothing) whilst the Church and they  
 stand in Contest about it. Be it how you will. Here without  
 a Iudge, we are got into the old Labyrinth again of an endless  
 Dispute, which can neuer Produce any thing like Evidence in  
 behalfe of Sectaries.

*The pre-  
 tended Evi-  
 dence of  
 Errours is  
 evidently a  
 Fourth.*

## CHAP. XVIII.

*Two Adversaries mainly Opposit to True Religion. The  
 last and most Urgent Proof of the Churches Infalli-  
 bility taken from the Necessity, the Notion and  
 Nature of true Religion. Mr Stillingfleets Objec-  
 tions found weak and weightles. Most of  
 them already Proposed and Dissolved  
 by others. A short Reflection ma-  
 de vpon some few.*

**E** Here is a Knot of half-witted People who Say, though  
 Religion Seem's indeed necessary to preserve huma-

Society in peace, And to Over-awe vniuſly Spirits, yet the  
 (were any Good) is no more but a meer Fiction, a forged  
 is fine an Errour. These men make nature Monstruous,  
 and consequently maintain two vast Paradoxes. The one,  
 That humane Societies euery were (That is) All Kingdoms, and  
 Common-wealths stand in need of Fiction and Errour to make  
 them happy. The Proposition is euident: For if peace, Tran-  
 quillity, and the subduing of vnquiet Spirits, be a true necessa-  
 ry Happines to all, And these cannot subsist without a fained  
 Religion, it is manifest that Fiction, Foolery, and Errour make  
 them happy, which is as much as to Say, a Constant Sicknes  
 keeps the body in health, weaknes giues it strength, Pain and  
 Suffering ease and refreshment. Certainly no less is errour disso-  
 lute to a rational Nature, than Sicknes repugnant to health,  
 cold fire, or heat to water.

*Two Tarn-  
 does main-  
 taines by  
 the first half  
 mad men.*

*Fiction and  
 foolery can  
 make no  
 man happy.*

The second Paradox wholly as bad and clear, keeps Pa-  
 rallel with this other. It is now supposed that Religion which  
 is nothing els but Fiction, necessarily conduceth to the Peace  
 of Kingdoms and Common-wealths, wherevpon their Happines  
 is more secure, And is better preferred than if this fiction  
 were not. Hence it followes euidently. To know and profess  
 Truth to quit our Selues of Errour and fiction, robb's vs of  
 Happiness and makes humane nature miserable. The Inference  
 is inuincible, For if we be happy vpon the score that we liue in a  
 Religion, we are miserable in case we get free of it or become Wise,  
 which is against the light of Reason, For if God has endued  
 all with a desire of true Wisdom and the knowledge of truth,  
 (whereof none can doubt) Man cannot be miserable if he Pos-  
 sesses that Good which the Author of nature would haue him  
 to enjoy. Hence it is also Inferred, that the vniuersal Perswa-  
 sion of true Religion is no Dotage, no Deception but a  
 Truth, and that most notorious.

*Nature is  
 not misera-  
 ble by being  
 freed from  
 dotage.*

Now if you Obiect, some liue without Religion, and  
 some embrace a false one; you plead by cases meetly Ac-  
 cidental, As if one should Say, Nature has made man Sociable



454 Disc. 2. C. 18. *The most vrgent proof*

*Cases merely  
Accidental  
made use of  
to no purpose*

and given him a tongue to Conuerse with others, But some are dumb, others abuse their faculty of speaking, Therefore man is no sociable creature. This is our case. Those who liue without all Religion, (if any such be) are the dumbe and blind: Those that Profess a fals Religion, like lying tongues abuse Gods Gifts, the Abuse is Theirs not God's, who would haue all to be *vnus labij* of one Tongue and one heart in a matter of so high Concern. And thus much of these first Aduersaries Opposite to true Religion.

*Sectaries pa-  
rall'd with  
the other  
Aduersaries.*

4. In the next place, I may well name our modern Sectaries no less than Arch-aduersaries of Religion, who make the Church and all that teach Church Doctrine false. My reason is. A *Fained* and *Fallible Religion*, are neer Cousins Germans. The one is a Fiction, The other at least may be so, And for ought any man can know, is no better. For there is no Principle whereby it may appear so much as probably, that all the Christians who liued since the Apostles time or yet are aliue, haue not been deluded with fictions concerning Gods truths, but rather are plunged into a deep Deluge of gross Errours, if the Church and Councils can Teach or be- lieue false Doctrin; And here be pleased to reflect a little, How neer these two Aduersaries come to one another.

*The Parallel  
is id forth,  
and proued.*

5. The first mentioned account it Happines to remain in Errour, and Sectaries like well not only the Possibility but more, a present manifest danger of erring in this matter of highest Consequence. Actual errour pleases the one, and a great hatred of it contents the other. Humane nature, say the first, would be miserable were men so wise as to learn this Truth, that Religion is a Foppery, though it be so, And we are all undone (Say Sectaries) could we acquire so much Wisdom in this present state, as to be infallibly Ascertained that Religion is no Foppery, which perhaps may be one. Wherefore to weaken all certitude They tell vs, That none can learn infallibly those truths which God has reuealed, because all Churches, all Councils, all Pastors and Doctors, whose Duty is to giue Assurance of our

fallible, And that the very best may erre and oblige men  
to Error. Here is all the comfort we haue from Se-  
Thus much premised.

We come to the fundamental Ground which proues our  
Catholic Religion, and the Church that teaches it to be infal-  
I said in the first Disc. C. 1. n. 9. Speaking against  
If we receiue the first lights of nature called general  
from any Power inferiour to God, They are all fallible,  
may deceive vs. This granted, which I think no Christian  
deny, It is most consequent to Assert, That if we receiue  
the Supernatural lights or truths of Grace reuealed in Scripture  
(which aboue all humane Comprehension,) from a lesse Power  
than God, the wisest of men may liue in error, and cannot  
be deceived. And thus both Nature and Grace necessarily  
depend on God.

This great Truth is the Apostles Doctrin. *Iacob. C. 1.*  
*Omne Donum perfectum de sursum est.* Euery perfect Gift  
comes from aboue, descending from that Father of lights. God  
therefore, rightly stiled the Father of light, or, as Diuines Speak,  
*Prima causa*, the first ynering Verity, Pleased to make known  
some of his Diuine truths in that Book of Holy Scripture.  
For I call them, compared with innumerable others, not as all  
reuealed, which yet his infinite Wisdom comprehend's, Howeuer  
these few (often darkly exprest in that mysterious Book,  
or in Terms lesse perspicuous) Dazle the eyes of weak sighted  
Mortals, and wonder nothing. The Apostle giues the Reason  
*1m. 6. 16.* because all proceed from him, *Qui lucem inhabi-*  
*ta inaccessibilem*, That dwell's in an vnaccessible light, none  
can attain vnto. Yet truths they are, the first ynering Verity  
Asserts it; and therefore ought to be esteemed treasures. If trea-  
sures, Providence will haue them conueyed vnto vs by secure  
means, And if eternal truths concerning Saluation, God cannot  
but will, and his Will is a law, That all be Proposed and  
Taught as Diuine and infallible Verities, depending vpon none,  
we ultimately bring them to their last Center) but vpon the  
first

*The funda-  
mental gro-  
und of the  
Churches  
Infallibility.*

*Deduced  
from the  
Apostles  
Doctrin.*

*Treasures  
Communi-  
cated,*

*How to be  
Valued,*

first Truth only, who neither will, nor can deceive any.

*The main  
Difficulty  
Proposed.*

8. Now here is the Difficulty. Seeing it hath pleased the mighty God for reasons best known to Himselfe, to leave much of the high Mysteries registred in Scripture in no little Obscurity, Some expresse his own Perfections of being one essence, and three distinct Persons, Others relate to the admirable works of Grace effected by his Infinite Power (Of this nature are the Incarnation, and the whole Series of mans Redemption) The Difficulty I say is to find out a trusty Interpreter, some faithful Oracle, which can when doubts occur concerning the darker Mysteries clear all, lay open the Book, and absolutely Assert. *An infinite verity speaks thus, This sense and no other is what the Holy Ghost intended.* And this is necessary, because Almighty God teaches no more immediately by himself, nor will tame Enthusiasms to be our Doctors.

*The necessity  
of an Infallible  
Oracle.*

9. Moreover the necessity of such a sure Oracle (if Divine truth must be learn'd) is proved vpon this ground chiefly. That these mysteries, as is now said, haue both their Difficulty and Darkeness. Natural reason left to it self boggles at them, *Jews, Gentils, and Hereticks* reject the highest. It is, Say they, mighty hard to believe a Trinity, the Divine Word made flesh, God and man to dye vpon a Cross &c. What can Reason yeild so far, or submit to, these as eternal Verities, when their last and only Proof is taken from a Book which we se evidently sented different wayes, and so interpreted, that One in rigour may own the Scriptures Diuinity as the Arians do, and yet so far fauour Reason, as not to force vpon it the Belief of such sublime secrets, which offer violence to our intellectual Faculties: Thus the Arians discourse.

*Quinced  
because the  
Mysteries  
are difficult.*

10. Now here I iustly appeal to the common Iudgement of Mankind, and Ask whether our God of truth, who on the one side perfectly comprehend's the depth of his own revealed Mysteries, and on the other, penetra's no less our shallow capacities (puzled as we se in the search of the most Obvious things in nature) could make chollse of men *morally* fallible, and

diuorced

deprived from Divine Assistance to interpret Scripture, whilst all of them none excepted, because errable, may grossly mistake and change the purest Verities which were ever yet revealed, into Errours. What think ye, could God who from Eternity foresaw, and yet sees his written Truths depraved, abused, and Heresies drawn from his most sacred words, Could this Almighty wisdom I say, put his own Sacred book into such Sacrilegious hands, or like well that a few scattered and diuided Sectaries should be the only best Interpreters of it?

11. I say yet more. All the men in the world, considered merely as nature has fram'd them, fallible, would commit the Sin of Presumption, and wrong both God and his verities, did they venture so far as to interpret Scripture by no other Rule or Law but by their own weak Reason, and there vpon resolutely define, that God is one pure Essence, and three real distinct Persons: Original Sin is such an evil as the Orthodox Church teaches: Children must be Baptized &c. To deduce thus much from the bare letter of Scripture, and to define euery particular resolutely, is above the force of all natural knowledge. Those then who Interpret the Truths of the first Alseing Verity that inhabits light not seen by our natural eyes, must be specially Priuiledged, and either receive illumination from the Father of Light, or thankfully take infallible Assistance from the Holy Ghost the Spirit of Truth, which is both promised and readily giuen to the Catholick Church.

12. Hence I deduce the Churches infallibility, and Argue thus. Either there is such a Society of men preserved by Providence infallible in all they Define and interpret, or not. If you Affirm, The Roman Catholick Church alone has the Priuiledge, for all others disclaim Infallibility. If you Deny. The highest Mysteries of Christian Religion are things only sought for, but not found, talked of, but neuer learned. In a word Religion is a meer Scepticisin, the best that learn it seem iust like those Schollers the Apostle mentioneth. 2. Tim 3. 6. Semper in doctrina &c. Alwaies learning, but neuer thoroughly instructed.

M m m

*Presumption  
in this mat-  
ter easily  
Committed.*

*Divine Assi-  
stance neces-  
sary.*

*A further  
Proof.*

If

458 Disc. 2. C. 18. *The most vrgent Proof.*

If I euidence not what is here said so manifestly, That no Sectary shall rationally coneradiet it, censure me at your pleasure.

13. A few Questions will clear all, And first I must Demand. From whence has that we call Religion its truth? All Answer from God the first vnerring Verity. Very right. But we Ask again, Where is the Master teaching Oracle which plainly deliuer's these reuealed truths, or clearly Proposes the Mysteries now named? Sectaries vsually tell vs, Their Oracle is holy Scripture. Herevpon followes à third Querie more difficult than all the rest. Viz. Who Ascertaines you *Arians*, you *Manichees*, you *Pelagians*, you *Protestants* you *Quakers* (All fallible) that you rightly vnderstand what you read, and grossly depraue not Gods Word, for without controuersy innumerable called Christians do depraue it? Protestants (à perfect Representatiue of all the other) shall Answer for all. O say they, *VVe read Scripture attentively, we pray for light, we peruse the Originals, we compare Passages with passage,* and after much pains taken we both belieue the highest Mysteries, and moreover perswade our Selves, that the new Model of Protestancy is conformable, or (at least) not Dissonant to Gods word. Here you haue their last and very best Principle, For they will not hear of an Infallible Church.

*The Sectaries presence to their reading Scripture, examined.*

14. Reflect Gentle Reader à little. Do Protestants only read, pray, peruse, and compare? No Certainly. The *Arians* long since haue done So, yet boldly oppose Protestants, and deny the highest Mysteries of our Christian Faith. If then the *Arians* Praying, perusing, and comparing proue no conuiction to Protestants, Why should the Protestants praying or perusing Conuince the *Arians* of Error? Again. Haue not Catholicks (think ye) of à longer continuance and far more numerous than Sectaries, prayed and perused Scripture? None can doubt it. And yet they hold the whole Model of pure Protestancy à Nought, and openly declare it Heretical. Therefore vnless Sectaries haue à singular talent in praying and perusing about all other Christians, Vnless they can produce better Proofs for the Mysteries of Faith against the *Arians*, and stronger Arguments against

*Arians also read, and Oppose Protestants.*

*So do Catholicks.*

Catho

Catholicks in behalf of Protestantcy, than the bare letter of Scripture. And their own weak conferring Texts together, or praying upon them, They do not only make Protestantcy ridiculous, but moreover, every new whimsy defensible; For was there ever yet Fatigue in the world that could not Say thus much? He certainly both professes and teaches truth, because he has a Bible, reads that, peruses it and prays earnestly. And will not any Adversary retort the Argument upon him and defend whatever foolery he fancies contrary.

Sectaries  
Presume to  
reading  
Scripture.

15. Believe it, if this way of Arguing have force the meanest Quaker in England, will make his cause good against the honest Protestant, and the Protestant if he say. I read, I ponder, I pray, proves his Religion every whit as strongly against the Quakers. That is, neither proves any thing. Nay more, the worst of Hereticks, may upon this ground maintain his Errours against the Orthodox Church (be that yet where you will) and could the Church only say, She reads Scripture, ponders it and prays, Her case would be the same with the worst of Hereticks, but besides reading and praying There are other Proofs, whereby One Church only is evinced God's Faithful Oracle

makes Pro-  
testancy  
ridiculous.

16. From what is now said I Argue first. A Principle, which makes false Religion true, yea all Religions though most erroneous as credible as true Religion, is more than intolerable. But this Principle of Protestants, we read Scripture, we ponder and pray, makes false Religions true, and all Sects though most erroneous as credible as true Religion is, Ergo it is more than intolerable. The Minor as is now said proves it self, For every Heretick pretends to read and ponder Scripture, but if you move a further Question concerning the Sense of what he reads, he returns you his own fancy as the best light he has, and makes that his Judge. This and no other is the Protestants Principle, and the chief, if not the only support, of all Heresy in the world.

The Secta-  
ries Prin-  
ciple makes  
false Reli-  
gions true.

17. I Argue. 2. And hold it a Demonstration. To make Religion a Scepticism eternally debatable, without hope of at-

M m m 2

taining



attaining truth at laſt, is wholly as ridiculous, as if two men ſhould goe to law meerly to wrangle, hopeles of euer hauing their cauſe determined. But this Proteſtant Principle. *U'e read, Pray and ponder* makes Religion à meer Scepticiſm without hope of euer knowing it, or hauing truth finally decided (*Semper diſſentes, they are alwayes learning but neuer well taught*). Ergo it is more than ridiculous.

*Another  
Convincing  
Argument.*

18. To proue the *Minor* let vs firſt ſuppoſe, that either we Catholicks, or Proteſtants teach and profels true Religion (both certainly do not, for we hold Contradiſtions). Suppoſe. 1. This falſity, which our Aduerſaries will haue ſuppoſed. Viz. That the Roman Catholick Church after all Her reading, and peruſing Scripture is as fallible in all She teaches, as Proteſtants confeſſedly are in what they deliuer after their reading. *Both teach as they doe contrary Doctrin, Tea and fallible Doctrin, yet both tell you, they teach true Doctrin.* Say I beſeech you, what man in his wits can believe Either vpon their bare Aſſertions, chiefly if we Suppoſe them of equal Authority? when he find's the Reſult of their reading, and peruſing Scripture, to end in nothing but in open Contradiſtions, and ſees plainly that the oppoſit Doctrin of the One Church, ſo much abates the Credit of the other teaching contrary, that in real truth both become Contemptible. And hence I Said, that which we call Chriſtian Religion would juſtly deſerue Scorn, if no Church teach it infallibly. But here is not all. To diſcouer more the groſs error of Sectaris in this particular,

*To teach  
Contrary  
Doctrin and  
true Doctrin.*

*is impoſſible.*

19. We are yet to Demand vpon whom this iarring Doctrin of the two diſſenting Churches now ſuppoſed Fallible is to be laid? Or whence it proceeds? Can it come from Gods ſpecial Aſſiſtance think ye? It is impoſſible. Becauſe God teaches no contradiſtions. Nay, if we conſider it as contradictory, no Spirit of truth can teach it. Therefore we muſt part the Doctrins, and Aſcribe to each Church its own particular Opinion, And then (were that poſſible) Examin which is true.

*A Doctrin  
taught  
fally.*

20. But here lies the Miſery. I ſay boldly. There neither

nor can be any appearance of certain revealed truth in either Church, not only because all Principles fail whereby to discern a certain Christian truth from Error, but most upon this ground, That we must now remoue the fallible taught Doctrins of both these Churches, from Gods *infallible Verity* and his Special assistance also, and make them lean vpon mans weak and shallow understanding. We haue no other Principle to rest on, if once infallible Assistance be excluded. But it is manifest, mans shallow capacity communicat's no Certainty to Any, concerning the high Mysteries of Faith, remoued from their Center (The first infallible Verity). Therefore all we can learn from such Teachers, is no more but doubtful Doctrin at most, or, if it reach to an Opinion meanly probable, there is all, Yet you haue often heard, (and it is a Truth) that no Principle less then one which is infallible, Can vphold our Christian Doctrin. Wherefore an vtter ruin of true Religion ineuitably followes vpon this Ground. As *Diuine Doctrin infallibly taught begets infallible Faith, so if taught doubtfully*, it begets only a doubtful Assent, which is no Faith at all. Now were these Doctrins respectiue to each Church probable (as I think neither would be if the Supposition of their fallibility stand's) we are only brought to the old Scepticism again, and may dispute of Religion as we doe of Probabilities in Schools, and so if men please, They may as often change Religion as they change Opinions, or appeal.

*Proceed's  
not from  
God.*

*But relies  
vpon mans  
weak Vn-  
derstanding.*

*No ground  
less then  
infallible  
Supports true  
Religion.*

21. Some perhaps will reply. Protestants can certainly Say more for themselves then only to tell you They read Scripture, and compare the Passages of it together by the light of their own weak reasons, Could so much indeed make them accomplished Doctors able to lay forth Gods eternal truths, it would seem strange, mighty bare, and dissatisfactory to Reason. Answ. Here is all you haue from them, For they neither do, nor can, pretend to more. Wherefore I challenge them again and again to Say plainly what other Principle can be relied on, nor wholly as doubtful, and as much controuerted as their very Religion

*Satisfies  
can pretend  
to no other  
Principle.*

*But to show  
own Campa-  
ring Scrip-  
ture.*

is, when they either teach, or interpret Scripture, contrary to the Roman Catholick Church. Obserue their Procedure. If à contest arises betwixt them and condemned Hereticks, The *ARIANS* for example, All ends in à meer throwing Texts at one another, And the sense must be iust so as each Party conceives. And do they not follow the same strain in every Controversy with Catholicks? One Instance will giue you sufficient light, and may well serue for all.

*Sectaries seek  
to quarrel  
but to End  
nothing.*

22. They (Protestants I mean) read those words of our Sauour. *This is my Body.* So do Catholicks also. They compare Text with Text, and Sense all as they please. Catholicks as wise and learned compare also, yet hold contrary Doctrine, and discover no little fraud in these new mens Deductions, and Criticisms. Say now plainly. Who is He that adds the Sceptick's part? Who is He that would endlessly quarrel about the Sense of Gods word? Is it the Catholick? No certainly. He is willing to haue the cause vltimately decided, He Petitions to haue these endles strifes remitted to the censure of one Supreme Iudge, to à Church which manifesteth it self by euident glorious Miracles (neuer yet censured, by any Christians but known Hereticks) and which finally has taught the world euer since Christ left it. Dare Sectaries do thus much? Dare they appeal to any Orthodox Church, by whose iust Sentence these debates may haue an End? No. They recoyle, and without listning to any Iudge but Them selues, would stil continue these Debates. Therefore they are the Scepticks. And to proue this, giue me leaue to propose one Question to the Protestant (He is the man we now treat with). Has he any Church so free from Censure, of so long Continuance, so glorious in Miracles as the Roman Catholick is. Has He any Council as generally receiued the whole world ouer, as either the Lateran or Florentine which euer interpreted Christs words or Sensed them as he doth? Most euidently no. Therefore I said well, His reading and glosses, and all he can Allege for himself, are nothing but His own

*A Conuin-  
cing Proof  
of our Affor-  
tion.*

weak

weak thoughts, as far remoued from the foundation of truth, (Gods infallible Verity) as earth is from Heauen and more.

23. But its needles to Prosecute this Point further, when the only reason, which none can contradict giues Euidence enough against Protestants. I Propose it thus. What euer Doctrin they teach peculiar to Protestancy, or maintain against the Roman Catholick Church, either proceed's from Gods infallible Assistance, or wholly borrowes strength from their own fallible Conceptions, after their reading and comparing Scripture. Grant the first; They teach infallible Doctrin, by virtue of Gods infallible Assistance, and consequently are the men who constitute an Infallible Church. Say secondly, that all they teach deriues force from their own weak reason (guided only by the external words of Scripture, vnderstood as they conceiue,) They teach as the Arians, and all Hereticks haue taught before them, a learning which is not from God. Their Doctrin in a word, Diuorced from all Diuine Aide and Assistance, stand's tottering vpon their own errable Sentiments, and therefore neither is (which I intended to proue) Christ's Doctrin, nor at all resoluable into that first Principle of truth, Gods vnerring Verity.

24. Shall we to giue some clearer Light to the Controverisy hitherto handled compendiously recapitulate a few of these many reflections made already in the foregoing Chapters? And then more establish the Churches infallibility vpon vndoubted Principles. To do so, may perhaps benefit the Reader.

25. Say therefore. Is it true that Christian Religion vltimately depend's upon God, the first vnerring Verity? No man doubts it. Is it true, that innumerable called Christians grossly misconceiue those vnderd Truths, after their reading and perusing Scripture? It is not less certain. Is it true, That the bare reading, and pondering Scripture no more ascertain's Protestants of the Verities there registred, than the Arians or any other Hereticks? The truth is vndoubted, For

Seſſaries  
teach Do-  
ctrin diuor-  
ced from  
Diuine Assi-  
stance,

And there-  
fore not  
from God.

A briue re-  
capitulation  
of what has  
been Said.

Seſſarino  
like Arians,

from

464 Disc. 2. C. 18. *The most urgent Proof*

*Fanaticism.*  
*Scripture*  
*wrested.*  
*Doubtful*  
*faith.*

*Comparing*  
*Texts, falli-*  
*ble.*  
*Scepticism.*

*No Judge.*

*No Orthodox*  
*Church.*  
*Nor Councils*  
*Want of In-*  
*fallible As-*  
*sistance.*  
*Fallible Pro-*  
*fessors, of*  
*fallible Do-*  
*ctrine.*  
*Divine Re-*  
*velation*  
*wronged.*  
*Doctrine ne-*  
*ver owned.*

*Endless Dis-*  
*putes.*

from whom should they have greater certainty. Is it true, That every Fanatique recurr's to Scripture, as Sectaries do? Experience proves it. Is it true, That this sole recourse to Scripture wrested to a sinister Sense, upholds the most false Sects in the World? Is it true, That Christian Doctrine, doubtfully taught, begets only a doubtful faith? Is it true, That the only support of Protestants in points of Religion amount's to no more but to their own doubtful and bare pondering Scripture, or to their various and fallible comparing Texts together? Is it true, That these men like Scepticks would stand everlastingly quarrelling about the sense of Gods Word, and cannot be induced to hear any Judge speak in this cause of Religion but themselves? Is it true, That we urge them to make choise of what Judge they please, provided they appeal not to their own Sentiments and Glosses, as much controuerted as Resistance? Is it true, That they can name no Orthodox Church which taught as they teach, glossed Scripture as they gloss; No Council generally received (Comparable either to the Lateran or Florentine) which favours their Interpretations forced upon Christs Words? Is it true, That the Doctrine they propound confessedly proceed's not from Gods infallible Assistance? Is it true, That they assume to themselves the name of Christians, and yet are ashamed to be called infallible Professors of the whole systeme of Christian Religion? Is it true, That they have done their utmost to take from Gods infallible Revelation its own intrinsic nature of Infallibility, by making it no more but morally certain in order to our Christian Faith? Is it true, That, that half infallibility some lay claim to, in a few yet unknown fundamentals, appears even to Protestants, not any Doctrine owned by the Christian World, nor can it appear otherwise, whilst a whole vniuersal Church deems it as improbable? Is it true, That These Nouellists raise not their Doctrine any higher, but only to an endless Contest, whilst no Judge but themselves must speak in the cause?

26. Are all these things (I say) more amply enlarged and clearly proved already so vndoubted that no Sectary shall ever rationally contradict them? If the Iudicious Reader find I speak truth, as he will, may Preiudice be laid aside, I may boldly Conclude. Who euer sees not the deplorable Condition of misled

Secularies, who ever see's not also an absolute necessity of an infallible Church to set them in the right way of truth Again  
a wilfully blind, supinely negligent, Yea vitterly Careless of  
Salvation.

## CHAP. XIX.

*Certain Principles, where upon the Churches Infallibility  
stands firm. The End of Divine Revelation is  
to teach all Infallibly. Every Doctrine revealed  
by the first Verity is no less infallible then true.*

*Its one thing to teach Truth, another to  
teach Divine and Infallible Truth. Se-*

*cularies Strangely Ingrateful. A*

*word of Mr Stillingfleets*

*Weak Obiections.*

1. **N**OW wee come to the last certain Principles where  
upon the Churches infallibilitie stands most firmly.  
Here is one. The Doctrine which God reveales, as it proceed's from  
the first everring Verity, is not only true but infallible. The Second  
Principle. Scripture which makes none infallible is often abused by He-  
reticks. The third Principle. Some Christians are yet in Being That  
but teach and learn this true Divine, and infallible revealed Doctrine,  
The Proof is easy: For vulefs some Teach and learn it, All Teach  
and learn another Doctrine distinct from that which God revealed,  
and this neither is, nor can be Divine, but meerly humane at most,  
and Perhaps a foolery. That therefore, which the Prophet  
Aserts. *Iohn. 6. 41.* All shall be *Docibiles Dei*, docible or  
taught of God, is not so, For now if the Supposition hold's,  
N. N. N. the

*Principles  
promised.*

*The Princi-  
ple Proved.*



the whole Church (take it in what Extent you please) is deluded as the Apostle Saith *Ephes. 4. 14 With the Wind of Doctrine, in the wickednes of men, in Craftines to the circumuention of error.* And this brings ruin to Christian Religion.

*A Church  
must be acknowledged  
absolutely  
infallible.*

2. The. 4. Principle. This Diuine Doctrin is not only true and infallible in it self, but moreouer so infallibly Proposed by one vnerring Oracle, That all who will receiue it, are most indubitably certain of those very truths which God has revealed, and therefore cannot err. Make good this one Proposition, We haue an infallible Church established, not only in a few nicknam'd vnknown fundamentals, but in euery Doctrin She teaches. Now the Proof is taken from the End of Diuine reuelation which seem's most Conuincing, For say I beseech you, Why did God impart truth and infallible truth to the world? The end was not to improoue his own knowledge, being euer *Omniscient*. It was not that the Angels, and blessed in Heauen should belieue, for Faith, ceaseth in that happy State. All these intuitiue, what they once believed. The end therefore why God reuealed true and Infallible Doctrin was, That we, yet Pilgrims on earth walking by Faith should yeild Assent to it, and belieue all as both *true* and *infallible*. But this is impossible, if the Church which immediatly Proposes the Doctrin can clash with Scripture or with Gods Reuelation, and peruert his Verities. Therefore She must be acknowledged both true and infallible in euery Doctrin She teaches.

*The Proof is  
taken from  
the End of  
Diuine Re-  
uelation.*

*Diuine re-  
uelation is  
to be assented  
to infallibly.*

3. If any reply. It seem's sufficient that the Church teaches Truth, though She neither proposes nor teaches it so infallibly, but that some times She may sweue from it, He destroyes again Christian Religion. Be pleased to obserue my reason. If the infallibility of reuealed Doctrin be lost as it were in the way between God and vs, If the Reuelation appear not as it is in it selfe infallible, when we assent to it by Faith, That is, if it be not infallibly conueyed and applyed to all by an vnerring Proponent, as it subsists in its first cause, *infinitely infallible*, Faith perishes, we are cast vpon pure Vncertainties, and may iustly doubt,

whether such a Doctrin, separated from that other Perfection of infallibility, be really true or no? To se this clearly laid forth, Please to make one reflection with me.

4. May not either Jew or Gentil, well inclined to Christian Religion rationally propose this Question to the Protestants or any? Has God reuealed any Doctrin which is only true, and not infallible? You will Answer, No, because the same definite verity which support's truth, is powerful enough to vphold also its infallibility. Say on I beseech you. Can you who pretend to teach truth (the worst of Heretiques haue done so) Ascertain me also, that you teach and propose Gods infallible Truths, *infallibly*? Proue your Selues such Doctors, and none will euer Question further the Truth of what you teach, For if you once make this clear, that you teach the infallible Doctrin which God has reuealed, the truth inseparably connexed with infallibility, is no more disputable but manifestly Credible. But if you turn me off, with a fair Story of teaching truth, and Ascertain me not of your teaching it infallibly, euery rational man will most iustly doubt of your teaching Truth. And here is the reason *a Priori*.

*God's reuealed Doctrin is no less infallible, then true.*

5. Euery Doctrin which is taught as a Verity, founded vpon God (the first Verity) is no less *Infallible* than *true*, Therefore who euer Ascertain's me of the one, must ioyntly ascertain me of the other: Or if he will diuorce truth from that perfection of Infallibility, he giues me no more but at most the half of that Doctrin which God reueal's. Nay I learn not so much from him, seing God own's no true Doctrin (men can teach natural truths) which is not as *eminently infallible, as true*. Now further. If I be fob'd off with no man knowes what halfes of Diuine Doctrin, That is, if the Proponent parts truth from its infallibility, and no Authority in Heauen or earth licences any to Separate what God has ioynd together, I only learn the faint Sentiments, or weak Opinions of fallible Teachers founded vpon fancy, which God disclaim's And (which is euer to be noted) man by nature fallible can do no more, but only propose them

*There is no purring infallibility from truth.*

*when we belinne God's reuealed Doctrin.*

as meer humane or doubtfull Vncertainties. But a humane doubtful Proposition, though true, hegets, as is said above, no certain faith in any, Therefore who euer will not vterly ruin the very life and Essence of Christian Religion, must absolutely assent both to the truth and *infallibility* of Religion, and consequently acknowledge an Infallible Oracle which teaches and proposes Infallible Verities, *infallibly*. But this is only the Roman Catholick Church, as is said above, for no other Society of men laies claim to teach Gods infallible truths, *infallibly*.

One Church  
only Infalli-  
ble.

6. To solue all Obiections against this Discourse, it will much auaille to be well grounded in this sure Principle. *Viz. It is one thing to teach truth, and another to teach Divine and infallible truth.* Man by natural-reason can teach truth, yet is insufficient to teach *Divine, revealed, and infallible Truth*; this must come from a higher Power, either from *Divine Assistance*, or *Supernatural Illumination*. If therefore the protestant Should demand, Why we cannot belieue his Doctrin euen when he only proposes those general Verities which all Christians admit (He neuer offers to Obtrude vpon you his inferiour Tenents peculiar to Protestants). Answer. They are truths indeed, and infallible truths, but not proued so, *because he vnassisted teaches them*. If he Ask again vpon what foundation do we Catholicks lay the truth and infallibility of that Doctrin we belieue and teach? Answer. Vpon this firm Ground, that Scripture interpreted by an *Assisted Oracle* (the Church), which cannot beguile any, Proposes all we learn, as *true and infallible Doctrin*.

A certain  
Principle.

Wherevpon  
our Answers  
to Seditaries

are ground-  
ed.

7. If he reply. 3<sup>d</sup> protestants abstract from the Churches Interpretation and hold Scripture plain enough in all fundamental Doctrin necessary to Saluation. Answer. He errs not knowing the depth of Scripture, which is so dark, and unintelligible in the abstruse Mysteries of faith, that vnless certain Tradition and the Sense of the vniuersal Church cast light vpon it, or impart greater clarity to the bare letter, The wisest of men will be puzzled in what they read, or at most guess doubtfully at its meaning, And therefore may easily swerue from truth. To see what I say, proued.

Scripture is  
obscure.

8. Imagine

Imagine only, that twenty learned Philosophers or more, who neuer heard of Church Tradition, or of her General assembly, had our Bible drop't down from Heauen with assurance that it contain's Gods infallible truths, prouided all they read be rightly vnderstood, but not otherwise. Suppose 1. They peruse that one Sentence in S. Iohns Gospel. *In the beginning was the Word, and that Word was with God. This was as in the beginning with God &c.* Suppose. 3. They also confer the Sentence with all other Passages in Holy Writ relating to this Mystery. Could these Philosophers think ye by the force of their natural discourse only acquire exactly the infallible truth of the Incarnation, iust so as the Church now teaches and belieues? No. Euery Particle would put them vpon a further Scrutiny. What is signified Saith one, by this. *In principio. In the beginning?* What is that *Word* said another, which was with God, or how was it with God? Was it One real thing Essential to him, or meerly a breath? *Word* terminated vpon creatures, without which nothing was made? All know though the Arians had a Church to such, yet with that sure Rule of faith they mangled and misdeed this very passage of the Gospel, Therefore difficulties much more would molest these Philosophers, hauing no Oracle to interpret, And as many would arise concerning other Scriptures, relating to the  *sacred Trinity, Original Sin, and the like Mysteries.*

9. Now here is my reflection, and I think euery Intelligent person will speak as I doe. Iust so much as these Philosophers haue to gloss with and descant vpon, So much Sectaries may challenge, but no more, if we seuer Scripture from the Churches Interpretation. Both haue a Body without life, words without sense, difficulties propofable concerning their reading, but none to Answer them.

10. The only difference between them is; That the Philosophers, yet ignorant of Church and Tradition haue no Schoole to go to. Sectaries haue both, yet run as it were

*The most learn'd Philosophers ignorant of Tradition and Church Doctrine.*

*Cannot vnderstand it.*

*An application made to Sectaries.*

*The difference  
between  
them and  
the Philo-  
sophers.*

*Whether Lu-  
thers follo-  
wers, or an  
Ancient  
Church is to  
teach?*

*Sectaries  
manifestly  
ungrateful,  
And why?*

*Recourse to  
the Primitive  
Church,  
frivolous.*

from Schoole with half a Lesson, with one part (and tis much the obscurer part) of Divine Learning only, the bare Texts I mean, of holy Scripture, shutting out the Churches infallible Sense. And what haue you in lieu of this light, which hath hitherto illuminated Millions of Christians? The weak and errable Sentiments of a few disynited Sectaries. And is this all we can rely on? Do we belieue the Trinity, the Incarnation and other high Mysteries (so obscurely expressed in Gods word, that innumerable haue mistaken the true Sense) because à Luther, à Calum, or their followers expound it? Or is our Belief grounded vpon that Churches Interpretation which has euer taught the world? The One or Other must haue influence vpon Faith, if we will belieue. But most manifestly the first (men only of yesterday, and fallible) are not our Doctors, Therefore the Church is the only Oracle which Ascertaines vs of the Scriptures Sense, of its Truth, and infallible Doctrin also.

11. Two things necessarily follow from this Discourse. The one. That Protestants Shew themselves strangely vngrateful, because they slight an Oracle, which has taught them all they know concerning the Primary Articles of Christian Faith, for in real truth the Churches Authority in Her expounding Scripture vpholds that true Assent they yeild to the Mystery of the Sacred Trinity. So much is granted, Or not. Grant it. Ask. Why disdain they to hear this Church in other matters? If you deny. Their Submission to this and the like Mysteries wholly relies vpon their own fallible dissatisfactory thoughts and glosses. Here Some perhaps will retire to the Primitiue Churches interpretation, and ground their Assent vpon Her Doctrin. Nothing is got this way, For the most Primitiue expolition of Scripture was no more infallible, than what the latter Church or Councils haue Defined. But enough is said above, of this Chasing all Controuerxies vp to the Primitiue Ages.

12. The second Inference is. If God has not made Religion

Matter of eternal Debate, If all are obliged to believe by divine Faith the very truths, yea the same infallible truths which God has revealed, and no other of a lower or slighter Rank; If he has revealed them for this end, that all may be Ascertain'd of their intrinsecal Worth, (That is,) of being both Divine and infallible; If the whole Christian world remain's not on this day in Errour, or is not cast vpon vncertainties what to believe; If both the truth and infallibility of all revealed Doctrin stand's and subsist's firmly ioyned together in God; the selfe same (impossible to be separated there). And if Finally as 'Tis there true and infallible, all are obliged to learn it: \*Nothing can be more manifest then that diuine Prouidence has established and impowred Some Oracle to teach and propose this very revealed Doctrin vnder its own Nature and Notion, and it is both true and infallible.

*A second Inference.*

13. Thus much Supposed and proued, All further Questions concerning the Oracle ceases, For it neither is, nor can be another but the Roman Catholick Church which has charge to interpret Scripture faithfully, to rescue Gods truths from the lewd misage of Heresicks. Clear therefore once that Sacred Book from abuse, I learn what this one certain Oracle teaches, our Faith is sound, Catholick, and Apostolical. But if Scripture by reason of its Obscurity deceiues any, or the Church could deuare from the sincere interpretation of Gods truths there registred, The Very life of true Religion is lost, Faith vanishes into error.

*The Oracle teaching truth cannot be questioned*

14. Who euer seriously Consider's what is already said in this and the precedent chapter will find Mr Scillingfleets scattered Objections against the Infallibility of Church and Councils utterly void of strength. Some worthy person of our Nation (who he is I know not) in his *Guide of Controversies*. Disc. 3. has so broken and vanquished the little force they haue, that I may well supersede all further labour herein. There is not one Objection proposed, but 'Tis either first, evidently retorted vpon Mr Scillingfleet, Or 2. Implies a pure begging of the Question.

*Mr Scillingfleet's Objections weightless*



*He Speaks  
not truth.*

*A Calumny  
for a Proof.*

*The first Ar-  
gument re-  
verted.*

*And clearly  
solved.*

sion. Or 3. Impugn's all Councils. Or 4. Appears so slight at the very first view, that it deserues no Answer. What can be more slight then to tell vs as he doth. p. 508. That we are absolutely auerse from free Councils, because we condemn all other Bishops but those of our Church without suffering them to plead for themselves in any *indifferent* Council. It is hard to say what the Gentleman mean's by *free* and *indifferent* Councils, for he fetters all with so many Conditions, that neuer any was yet found in the Church so qualified, as he would haue it. Read him through his 1. and 2. Chapter, as also p. 557. You will se what I assert, Manifest. It is true, we condemn all heterodox Bishops (and doth not Mr Stillingsfleet re-criminate, and condemn ours?) But to say we suffer none to plead for Themselves in a free Council is a flat Calumny, unless that only be free which some bodies fancy makes free, and no other. A word now to one or two Obiections.

15. If you (saith Mr Stillingsfleet) require an Assent to the Decrees of Councils as infallible, There must be an antecedent Assent to this Proposition. *That whatsoever Councils decree, is infallible.* I first retort the Argument. If you require an Assent to your Definitions in the Dort-Meeting, Or hold That the conuened there deliuered *true Doctrin*. There must be an antecedent Assent to this Proposition, That what soeuer those Dort-men taught is *true Doctrin*, before you own it as *true*. As certain vs of thus much, And you solve your own difficulty. If this Instance please not, make vse of another. Your Ministers in England pretend to teach *true Doctrin*, though not *infallible*. Say only vpon what antecedent Proposition the Truth of their Doctrin is assented to by all, before it be belieued as *true*, and we shall without labour Answer in behalf of our *infallible Doctrin*.

16. In a word thus Catholicks plead. This generall Proposition is to be assented to, as both true and infallible. *Viz. All are obliged to Hear and Belieue the Pastors of God's Church when Lawfully Commissioned to teach in God's name, and as the Orthodox Church teaches.*

Here is the Thesis or the vniuersal receiued Proposition: These Pastors and Doctors when assembled in Council are Pastors of the Church and lawfully commissioned to teach in God's name, both true and infallible Doctrine. Therefore they are to be heard and believed in all and euery Definition, proceeding from that Assembly, lawfully conuened. Here you haue the Hypothesis as indubitably certain, as the Thesis.

A second Obiection you meet with in his Page 509. *What infallible Testimony haue you* (he means Catholicks) *for this, that Councils are Infallible?* It is not enough for you to say, That the Testimonies of Scripture you produce are an Infallible Testimony for it: But that were to make the Scripture the sole Iudge of this great Controversy, which you deny to be the sole Iudge of any. I first retort the Argument and Ask. What Testimony haue you Sectaries (I do not say Infallible) But so much as seemingly probable taken from Scripture, whereby Councils (the greatest Representatiues in God's Church) are made fallible? Not one can be alleged.

18. Now my Answer briefly is. Scripture once admitted for God's word (which our Adversaries will not reflect on) manifestly conuinceth the Churches infallibility. To those express and significant Passages of holy Writ known to euery one (*The Church is the pillar and ground of Truth*) you haue them already, We add the iudgement of Fathers cited aboue (The guide of Controversies. C. 3. P. 147. Produces more). Besides, Gods Church which we hold an Infallible Oracle, interpret's Scripture in this sense, and here are our abundantly full Principles for Her Infallibility. Come you Sr, now closely to the point, consider if you can with as many Passages of Scripture, as many Testimonies of Fathers, Or (and this we alwayes vrge) with the Authority of any Orthodox Church which fauours your contrary Tenet of Fallibility, The Strife is ended. But hereof there is no fear at all. And thus you see how Scripture is the Iudge when once admitted as Diuine, and faithfully interpreted, not otherwise.

*Another  
Obiection  
retorted, and  
Solved.*

*The Catho-  
lick Princi-  
ples for  
Infallibility.*

*Sectaries  
haue none  
for their  
Tenet.*

19. A. 3. Obiection. Page. 509. The Decree or Definition  
O o o of a

*A third  
weak objec-  
tion refuted*

of a Council receives Infallibility from the Council before the Pope confirm's it, or not. If not; The whole infallibility reſides in the Pope, and this ſome Say is not: *de Fide uniuerſali*. If it ariſe from the Council before the Pope confirm's it (for that act of confirmation followes the Definition) the Council is infallible antecedently to the Popes Confirmation. I firſt retort the Argument. An Act of Parliament, or a Law made for all, receives its force from the Conuened Members before his Maieſty Confirm's it, or not. If not; The whole Power of making ſuch a Law reſides in His Maieſty, which ſome will ſay is not ſo. If it ariſe from the Parliament, before His Maieſty Confirm's it (and that Confirmation followes the Act) The Parliament is impow'r'd to make ſuch Lawes, before His Royal Aſſent Confirm's them. Here is the very ſame Form of arguing (though in a different matter) and you ſee the weakneſs of it.

*And ſolued.*

20. The true Answer to the Obiection is as followes. Every Doctrin definable may be conſidered two wayes, firſt as it Proceed's from God the moſt ſupreme Verity, and vnder that Notion, it is both true and infallible in it ſelf before the pope and Council Define it, (And note, they can Define no other Doctrin on earth, but what God ratifies in Heauen). 2. It may be conſidered as the Doctrin of the *Representatiue Church* infallibly aſſiſted to reach Diuine truths; And vnder that Notion it is called *Church Doctrin*, proceeding from the Head and Members of one myſtical Body: The Head therefore Separated or ſolely taken, Defines not in Councils, The Members diuided from the Head define not, But one and the ſame Definition proceed's ioyntly from both Head and members vnited together. The Inſtance already hinted at giues light enough. If any reply, The Definition when the Council propoſed it, was both true and infallible Doctrin. I diſtinguiſh the Propoſition. It might be then Certain and infallible Doctrin in it ſelf (that's true) but as yet it is neither known or owned as ſuch or called Church Doctrin: It was then the whole *Councils* or *Churches* true and infallible Doctrin, I deny it. This is founded vpon both Pope and Council.

*Every Doctrin true  
in it ſelf,  
is not ſuch  
ſure Church  
Doctrin.*

Disc. 2. C. 19. *The Churches infallibility.* 473

Council infallibly assisted, as is now supposed, and already proved. I find no more in Mr Stillingfleet worth any notice that which follows in his Page 510. ouerthrowes all councils or proves nothing. What certainty haue you, Saith he, that this or that Council proceeded lawfully? That the Bishops were lawful Bishops? That the Pope who confirm's them was a lawful Pope? That some ~~by rule~~ or ~~interest~~ <sup>by rule</sup> <sup>swayed</sup> not many? That all conditions were exactly performed &c. I Answer first, and Ask. What certainty haue you of any illegal Bishops, of unlawful Popes, of Interest Swaying all. Here because you accuse, we put you to the Proof. I Answer, 2. That Certainty which you or any has of no ~~by rule~~ in the four first general Councils, of their lawful Bishops, of no interest swaying, &c. The same we haue of all the approued Councils in Gods Church. To insist further upon such faint Objections, is only to lose time or (might one retaliate in Mr Stillingfleets own language) ~~to run after them~~ <sup>to run after them</sup> <sup>and make short work of them</sup>. And thus much of the Churches Infallibility, (I mean the Roman Apostolical Catholick Church) to whose Censure and infallible iudgement I do most willingly submit my Selfe, and euery Christian in this Treatise.

*Objections wanted as impertinent.*

## THIRD DISCOVERSSE

OF.

*The Resolution of Faith:*

**T**He subiect here hinted at, is as all Shollers know very Speculative. Terms, according to my little Skill in the English Tongue, often Fail to exprels what is necessary. Wonder not therefore, if now and then you meet with that which may seem Obscure to a Vulgar Reader. My Endeauour Shall be to giue the Discourse so much Light, as that Euery one may perceiue the Aduersary I treat with, clearly refuted.

THE

# THE FIRST CHAPTER

Some chiefe Contents in this Discourse briefly declared:

Mr Stillingfleets weak attempts against the Churches infallibility and the Resolution of Faith.

The Catholick way of resolving Faith, the very same with that of the Primitive Christians.

Of the mistakes which run through.

Mr Stillingfleets whole Discourse.

IN the following Chapters, we first remove such difficulties as may seem to obstruct the clearest Resolution. And all along discover Mr Stillingfleets Errors, viz. Chiefly those most apparent in his 5. Chapter. 2. We examine what Influence the Motives of Credibility have over Faith. 3. Necessary Principles are premised much availing to Conceive the true Analysis. 4. We Shew wherein the Main Difficulty lies in the Resolution (Omitted by Mr Stillingfleet) and solve it. 5. The whole Progress of Faith is Explained in order to its last Resolution. 6. The true Analysis is given in two Propositions. Here we also treat of the Evidence of Credibility, and solve the Sectaries Objections. 7. This question is proposed. *Whether the Churches Testimony may be Called the Formal Object of Faith?* 8. We Ask what is meant by this word Reason, And enquire how far true Reason conduces to end Controversies? 9. Proposition is proved a most vnreasonable Religion.

Mr Stillingfleet. Part 1. C. 5. P. 109. offers at much, it is to discover strange ill Consequences, yea grand Absurdities, if Faith be resolved by the Churches Infallibility; and seems to be over-heated in carrying on the cause against his Ad-

*What this  
third Dis-  
course  
contains.*

*Our Adversaries bold adventure,*



478 Disc. 3. C. 1. Catholick resolute faith. an

versary. Let any man (saith he) judge whether this be not the most compendious way to overthrow the belief of Christianity. There is hardly any thing more really destructive to Christianity, or that has a greater tendency to Atheism, than the Modern pretence to infallibility. The unreasonableness of it is so great, that I know not whether I may abstain from calling it ridiculous. And much more to this Sense.

What his  
Adversary  
asserted.

3. It seems by what I read in Mr Stillingfleet T. C. (whose Book I had not then seen) said that Catholicks in this present State, resolute their Faith after the very same manner, as the Israelites anciently, and the Primitive Christians resolved Their. If he said that, he Spake a Truth, not only defensible; but so Sound and Irrefragable, that Mr Stillingfleet (to use his own pretty Phrase) like one vnder an Ephialtes Shall tumble, groan, tosse this way and that, and yet not rid himself of the veration.

Is Sound  
Doctrin.

4. The Doctrin I find plainly delivered, and the Instructions of the ancient Israelites and the Primitive Christians, so well made use of for the Catholick Resolution by our learned Countryman, Thomas Bates Southwell. *Analysis Fidei*. Disp. 4. and 5. That here I must needs insert some Part of it, because it is so suitable to Conceive the easiest way of resolving Faith, And well penetrated so vitally defeats what Mr Stillingfleet has, the much more is not requisite to make void this smokes Objections.

How the  
Israelites  
questioned  
about faith.

5. F. Southwell therefore, *Analysis Fidei* now cited, chap. n. 18. Speaks much to this Sense. Had you asked a true Believer in Moses his time after the Pentateuch was written, Why believe you that God is just, wise, faithful in his Promises? Or (if you will have one particular) why Adam sinned in Paradise? He would have answered Scripture. Such as But if again demanded, How know you that Scripture is Gods Divine word? Would he think ye have answered, I know by the very light and Sparkling of the Letter? It is impossible as shall be proved afterward. Thus therefore He would have replied. Moses our great Prophet Affirms it, or what God

God speaking by the mouth of Moses saies that Verity open  
 ed, And upon that ground I believe it. So we read, Deuter.  
 18. *These I speak to the Children of Israel all which God hath com-  
 manded him to say to them.* Now if thirdly Questioned. How  
 have you that Moses was a true Prophet, or God's Oracle,  
 He could not have satisfied by alledging Scripture, without a  
 vicious Circle, but would have Said: This truth is immediately,  
 and most evidently Credible by it Selfe, for the Wisdom, Sanctity,  
 and Power of working Miracles, manifest to all eyes, proue to  
 Reason, that Moses is a great Prophet.

*Would have  
 answered?*

In like manner Catholicks proceed in their Resolution  
 of Faith. Demanded why we believe the Mystery of the In-  
 carnation, it is Answered Scripture Assert's it. Ask again, why  
 we believe the Divinity of that Book called Scripture? It is  
 replied. The Church ascertain's of That. But how do we  
 know that the Church herein deliuer's Truth? It is Answer-  
 ed, if we Speak of knowledge preuius to Faith, Those admi-  
 rable Signs of Divinity mentioned above, and manifest in this  
 Oracle. Viza. The Sanctity of life the Contempt of the World,  
 the austere Austerity of Penitence, the height of Contemplation  
 appears in thousands and thousands, And above all the glorious  
 shines most illustrious in this one Society of Christians proue  
 the Oracle so evidently credible, That we cannot, if prudent and  
 correct Reason guides vs, but as firmly believe what ever this  
 Church teaches, as the Israelits believed Moses and the Prophets.  
 Nor is only the difference (And the Advantage is ours) that  
 in Lieu of Moses we have an ample Church: Innumerable  
 multitudes in place of one Seruant of God, The incomparable  
 greater light, I mean, the Pillar and Ground of truth, the Catho-  
 lick Church diffused the whole world ouer.

*Catholicks  
 in this pre-  
 sent State,  
 return the  
 very same  
 Answer.*

*One only  
 Differentia  
 aduanti-  
 giours for vs.*

Answerable to this Doctrin the primitive Christians re-  
 tained their Faith, after the Canon of Scripture was written.  
 Ask therefore why these first conuerted People, whether Jewes  
 or Gentils, believed Christ to be the true Messias, the Son of  
 God, and Sauour of the world? They might haue Answered.

*The Primitive Christians way of resolving Faith.*

red. We read this and much more in Holy Scripture, how know you, that these Scriptures are not suppositions or fained, as some Gospels have been? We believe this, Say They, vpon the vndoubted Testimony of those blessed men the Apostles, who both taught vs, and wrote that holy Book. Yet more. How know you that those Apostles were not Cheats (for there haue been false Prophets and Apostles) but men Authorized by Almighty God to teach and write his holy Verities? Had they replied, We proue this by Scripture it self, the Circle would haue been ineuitable. For to Say Scripture is Gods word, because the Apostles Assert it, and to Say the Apostles are infallible Oracles of Truth, because Scripture affirm's that, is to Prove *Idem per Idem*; And implies a most vicious Circulation.

*Is Our way also.*

7. Their Answer then must haue been, for there is no other. The manifest Miracles wrought by the Apostles, Their eminent Sanctity and Holines of life (our Lord working with, and confirming their Doctrin by manifest Signes) proued them Gods Oracles, True and faithful commissioned Teachers. And thus we discourse of the Church Whose vndeniable Miracles, Sanctity, and Conuersions wrought by Her, conuince reason of this great Truth, that She only is Gods Oracle. All this is said supposing the Canon of Scripture already compleat. For if we goe higher, and consider a Church (whether it be that of the ancient Patriarchs, of the Israelits, or finally of the Christians before Scripture was written) Faith must be resolved into Diuine Reuelation by the means of some liuing Oracle (Whether One or more it imports not) who manifested themselves Gods commissioned Teachers by signes and Miracles. Whereof more afterward.

*Three Mistakes chiefly pointed at*

8. This much premised (And it is Very easily vnderstood) you shall see Mr stillingfleets verbose Obiections brought to nothing, but to meer Cauils and Mistakes. Three Mistakes chiefly, run through his whole 5. Chapter. First he strangely confound's the Iudgement of credibility necessarily prerequisite to true Belief, with the very Act of Faith it Self, whereas the

*Resolu-*

of these two, haue indeed a due Subordination to one another, yet depend vpon quite different Principles. The Iudgement of Credibility whereby the will moues and commands the Intellectual Faculty to elicit Faith, relies not vpon that which finally Terminates Faith it self, But vpon extrinsecal Motiues which perswade, and Powerfully induce to beleue,

*The first breeds Confusion.*

Here is the Reason. The high Mysteries of Faith, the Trinity, for example; *Original Sin*, and the like Transcend our natural Capacities, or to speak with some great Diuines are *naturally Incredible*, Therefore Prouidence hath by the force and efficacy of extrinsecal motiues, raised them from that degree of natural Incredibility, and made all most credible to humane Reason. And this no Sectary can deny, For before that Doctrine be believed which he embraces, and before he reiects the contrary not believed by him, He will tell you, He hath Motiues and reasons as well for the one as the other. Here is what I require at present.

Mr Stillingfleets second errour is, that he distinguishes between the nature of *Science and Faith*. Science is worth nothing unless it *proue*, and Faith purely considered as Faith, (mark well my words) is *worthless*, if it *proue*, For as innumerable Fathers affirm, *Fides non querit quomodo*. Faith reasons not, nor Asks how these Mysteries can be, but simply believes. Science makes vse of Principles, *Per se nota*, known by themselves And then discourses, Assuming nothing but what is proved wherefore no virtue, no validity, can be in the progress, or end of a rational Discourse, which was not precontained in the first assumed Principles. Faith, 'tis true, has its Preambulatory Motiues, as we haue seen already, yet *scientifically* drawes no Conclusion from them (and herein Mr Stillingfleet all along beguiles himself, and the reader). The Motiues inducing to beleue the Truth. *God has revealed a Mystereous Trinity* are morally certain, yet there is a more firm Adhesion to the infallibility of that same Testimony for which we beleue, than the extrinsecal

*In the second Science and Faith are not.*

*Sufficiently distinguished.*

482 Disc. 2. C. 1. *Catholicks resolute Faith*

Motives inducing to belief either do or can draw from us. And in this sense Faith contrary to Science, goes far beyond the certainty of all extrinsecal Inducements, as shall be presently declared.

*The third  
also wants  
a Distin-  
ction.*

11. Our Aduersaries third Mistake lies here, That he distinguishes not, between the *humane* and Diuine Authority of the Church. S. Austin Lib. con. Epist Fundam. C. 4. Speaking of the first, Saith. *The profound Wisdom of so many Doctors, the consent of Nations, the Antiquity, the continued Succession of Pastors &c.* held him within the Pale of the Church Catholick, yet this Authority precisely considered as *humane*, and therefore fallible, is not sufficient to ground Diuine Faith. I say as *humane*, for though I believe that the Church has euer been *Visible*, with a continued Succession of Commissioned Pastors to teach Orthodox Doctrine, yet my Act of Faith no more relies vpon such motives, considered merely as *Motives*, inducing to believe, Than the Primitive Christians Faith relied vpon the visible Miracles, which Christ or his Apostles wrought.

*What caused  
our Aduer-  
saries Error*

12. As therefore that first Act of Faith, whereby they believed our Saviour to be the true Messias, was built vpon his infallible Diuine Authority, manifested by Miracles, Sanctity of life &c. So that first Act of Faith whereby euery one believes the Church to be God's own Sacred Oracle, is built vpon Her infallible Diuine Authority manifested by Miracles, and other signal Marks of truth, whereof Scripture plainly Speaks. *Her gates shall not preuail against the Church. She is the Pillar and ground of truth.* And so much is said aboue. C. 16. 17. that I know well Sectaries cannot Answer. The not reflecting vpon this twofold Authority which Mr Seillingfleet knowes Catholicks do distinguish, makes his Circle charged on vs so irregular a Figure, that it look's rather like a Rhomboides than a round Circle, as shall appear presently, with a further Discouery of his other mistakes. One thing I cannot but admire, and 'tis, That though his 5<sup>th</sup> Chapter be tediously long, yet the main and most need

*Difficulty*

Difficulty concerning the Resolving of Faith is scarcely so much  
to hand as. After a few Pages I will propose the Difficulty,  
and endeavour to solve it.

## CHAP. II.

Mr Stillingfleets 5. <sup>th</sup> Chapter. Part. 1. examined, is  
found VVeightles. The Weaknes of his Arguments  
discovered. His First and chiefest Argument  
retorted and solved.

1. I Must and will waite all this Gentlemans Parergons, all  
frivolous excursions with his vnciuill language, and if I  
touch in a word vpon his pretty conceited Icers scattered here  
and there, it shall only be *Petransennam*, as if I little minded  
them.

2. Thus he begins. Page 112. The Infallible Testimony of your  
Church is the only Foundation for Diuine Faith, and this Infallibility  
may be known by the Motiues of Credibility (He means in this  
present State) Therefore this Way of resolving Faith is unreasonable,  
because it requires an infallible Assent vpon probable grounds beyond  
all Proportion or degree of Euidence, which is as much as requiring  
infallibility in the Conclusion, where the Premises are only probable.  
Note. Our Adversary Spoils a good Difficulty by proposing  
a liney, He would fain say some thing like that which Ca-  
tholick Diuines learnedly propose whilst they handle the Reso-  
lution of Faith, But so fumbles and doth it by halves, that He  
reaches not home to the main Business.

Our Adver-  
saries first  
Argument.

The difficul-  
ty not fully  
proposed.

3. I Say therefore first. The Argument proposed if of any  
force, destroys all Faith even the most Primitive. To pro-  
ue the Assertion I Ask, whether the first Christians believed  
infallibly



*The Argu-  
ment rejoy-  
ced.*

infallibly the Infallible Testimony of the Apostles Preaching with a Divine Infallible Assent? Most certainly they Did. Yet the Infallibility of that Testimony was not known (if we speak strictly of Knowledge) but by Motives of Credibility which were no Object of their Faith (unless you make faith to be Science) but Inducements only to believe. Ergo this very Primitive Faith was vnreasonable, because it was an infallible Assent built upon probable grounds, beyond all Proportion or degree of the Evidence, whereby those pious men were moued to believe. Hence You Se, though the Motives which illustrate the Church were in themselves fallible, and not Metaphysically conezed with the Diuine Testimony, yet Faith grounded on that Testimony cannot but be certain and infallible, and consequently must transcend, or goe beyond all the degrees of Certitude appearing in the prerequired Motives. Mr Stillingfleet reply's. *This is to require Infallibility in the Conclusion, where the Premises are only probable.* Answ. He errs not knowing the nature of Faith, which Discourses not like to Science. For example. Make this Sillogism. *Whateuer God reueal's is True, but God reueal's the Incarnation of the Diuine Word, Ergo that is true.* The difficulty only is in the Minor. But God reueal's, which cannot be proued by another believed Article of Faith, wholly as obscure to vs as the Incarnation is. I say proued by Reason; because the same difficulty will be as much moued again Concerning the Proof of that second believed Article, as concerning the first of the Incarnation, and so in Infinitum. Therefore all rational Proofs auailing to beget Faith in any, must of necessity be extrinsecal to belief, and lie as it were in another Region more clear (yet less certain) than the reuealed Mystery it, we assent to by Faith.

*And Show'd  
Proofs.*

*Rational  
Proofs for  
the Church's  
Infalli-  
bility.*

4. Now to our Purpose. We hold this an Article of Faith. *The Church is God's infallible Oracle,* And therefore Say, antecedently to Faith it cannot be proued by Arguments as obscure, or of the same Infallible certainty with Faith, For then Faith would be superfluous, or rather we should believe by a firm and infallible Assent, before we do believe upon the Motiue of Gods infallible Reue-  
tion,

which is impossible. Hence it is that when we goe about to prove the Infallibility of the Church independently of Scripture, and also independently of all believed Church Doctrine, we must necessarily Euince this rationally, by reflex Arguments and Motives extrinsecal to what we Believe, which are not of the same certainty with Supernatural Faith itself. Now these Arguments founded vpon the Motiues of Credibility can goe no further (stretch them to the vtmost) But only to proue this great Truth. That what euer we believe, either of Scripture, or of the Church is most evidently Credible about all things propofable to the contrary, And this great light the learned at least haue, before they yeild an infallible Assent vpon Diuine Reuelation to the very Doctrine of the Church, or Scripture either.

I Say. 2. Mr Stillingfleet and all Sectaries, whilst They dispute with an Infallible Assent the most fundamental Articles in Scripture, goe beyond all Proportion of that Euidence whereby they are induced to Believe, And consequently must Solve their own first Argument, yet strong *Ad hominem* against them. If I haue not, this Truth blame me boldly, And obserue my Proof.

The Sectary believes that Verity which S. Iohn expresses in this short Sentence. *The Word was made Flesh*: That is, he believes the Incarnation of the Son of God with an Assent so inflexible, that it cannot only be false, but that he would not believe it vpon any reason Propofable, Though an Angel should say Contrary, But neither this Act of Faith, nor its Formal Object (the Diuine Reuelation) are *ex terminis* evidently true, Quod non, yet must be proued Evidently Credible to reason, or Faith becomes vnreasonable, and rash, For, *Quicquid credit leui est corde*. Now further. None can proue this, by another Act or Article of Faith (no more its own Self-euidence than the believed In-formation is) All therefore which can be done, is to make it evidently Credible by Motiues extrinsecal to Belief; by vniuersal Tradition, and the Consent of innumerable learned men, who haue both conteyned vnto vs the Words as Diuine Scripture,

Have not  
the certain-  
ty of Faith.

what these  
Motiues  
Prooue.

Sectaries goe  
beyond that  
Euidence  
whereby  
they are  
induced to  
believe.

The Affor-  
tion, Proued.

*Our Adversary  
says Clearly  
Convinced.*

*The Convi-  
sion mani-  
fest.*

*Another  
most Con-  
vincing  
Proof.*

*Not to be an-  
swered.*

and the genuine Sense of them also. But this very human Tradition, this exterior Consent of all, or what other Motives can be Imagined preuius to Faith, (because fallible,) may deceive: Yet by the help of such fallible Motives Mr Stillingfleets Faith, if it rest's vpon the Diuine Reuelation is raised higher, and stand's firmer vpon that Ground, than the Evidence of his Motives can induce to. Therefore he makes this conclusion surer than the Premises, And goes beyond all Proportion and degree of fallible Evidence, preambulatory to his certain Belief. What I Assert is manifest. For by Faith he Says the Incarnation is to infallibly true, that it cannot be false, Yet all the Motives which induce him to believe Say, possibly it may be false, or exclude not à Possibility of falsehood. And if this be not to Transcend all Proportion of his acquired Evidence, nothing is to goe beyond it.

7. The Argument will be yet more clear if proposed after this manner. Mr Stillingfleet infallibly believes the truth of that Scripture now Quoted. I Ask by what means can he know That this very believed Truth is à Diuine Verity, or Scripture? The Answer may be, That's known vpon Tradition, or the publique Authority of all, not only Christians but others also, who haue conueyed the Book to vs. Very good. But this Publick Authority, this Conueyance, or what ever Tradition you will, is either of equal infallible certainty with the Believed Truth of Scripture, Or less and much weaker. If less and weaker, Mr Stillingfleets Faith goes beyond all proportion and degrees of his preuius acquired Evidence. And it be of equal infallible Certainly (That is) If he believes as infallibly the Conuoyance of those Words, For, or from Gods Diuine Testimony, as he believes the Doctrine there contained to be à Diuine Truth, He makes one Article of Faith the Proof of another, and evidently incurs the Circle objected to Catholicks, as shall appear afterward, When we examin his 17th Page, and refute his Errour concerning the Moral Certainty of Faith.

Now to the Obiection. *it is not possible, That the Assent*  
*of Faith rise higher, or stand firmer than the Assent to the*  
*Testimony, upon which those things are believed.* Answer. Very  
 But know Sr, we Assent to matters of Faith vpon Gods  
 Testimony, and not for the Motiues which only induce  
 to believe. So the Primitive Christians believed vpon Christ's  
 Testimony, and built not their Faith vpon the ex-  
 terior Motiues Euidēt to Sense, which meerly considered as  
 such only made his Testimony highly credible to Reason. Viz.  
*That it was Divine and infallible.* Forexample. Some saw, Others  
 heard of our sauiours great Miracles, of his admirable Sanctity,  
 And then discoursed. The Man that doth these wonders can-  
 not but be one sent from God. It is true, he preaches both new  
 and difficult Doctrin to our eares, But if he be sent from God,  
 we are obliged to Believe him vpon his word, And vpon that  
 Word Their Faith relied.

*A Mistake  
in the Obie-  
ction.*

*One Instan-  
ce which  
none can  
boggle at.*

Apply this Instance to the Church, you haue all I would  
 say. The Church is evidenced by Miracles, Sanctity of life  
 Millions, by Conuerfions and the like signal Motiues.  
 Here are the Inducements which proue Her Gods Oracle, and  
 the Doctrin highly credible, about what euer all other Societies  
 of Christians haue Taught, Yet our Faith is not built  
 vpon these Motiues considered as Inducements, but vpon Her  
 infallible Testimony. The Instance now giuen Concerning the  
 most Primitive Believers is so clear, That our Aduersaries shall  
 neuer weaken the force of it, or shew the least Disparity.

*Clears all.*

10. And thus you se all Mr Scillingfleets talk. P. 113 Comes  
 to nothing. I desire Saith he to know, *whether an infallible As-  
 sent to the Infallibility of your Church can be grounded on those Mo-  
 tiues of Credibility?* Answ. And I desire to know whether an  
 infallible Assent to the Apostles Preaching, was grounded on  
 such Motiues which the Primitive Christians saw or heard of  
 before they believed? what you say, I'll say. Briefly. Many  
 learned Divines hold the Motiues of Credibility Metaphysically  
 connected with Gods diuine Testimony speaking by the Church,  
 and

*A Question  
answered,  
and returned.*

Shew'd also  
impertinent.

and if that opinion be true, the Motives ground an *Infallible Assent* but *that's Evidence*, and no Faith, And therefore most impertinent to your following Inference. If, (a) you, *we* *ground* the Motives ground an *Infallible Assent*, there can be no imaginable necessity, to make the Testimony of our Church *infallible*, in order to *Divine faith*. For, *we* *Catholicks*, you hope will not deny, but that there are at least equal Motives of Credibility to prove the *Divine Authority* of the Scriptures, as the *infallibility* of our Church, And if so, why may not an *Infallible assent*, be given to the Scriptures upon the Motives of Credibility, as well as to our Churches *infallibility*? *Answer*. A strange kind of Argument.

No Motives  
make scrip-  
ture evident-  
ly credible.

Indepen-  
dently of  
Church Au-  
thority.

11. First, Sir, you know, or should know, *Catholicks* hold with *S. Austin*, That no certainty can be had of Scripture without Church Authority (How then do you say, *You hope we will not deny* &c). No Motives as is proved above and in the other Treatise also, immediately make Scripture credible, independently of the Churches Tradition. No Miracles were ever heard of which proved the book of *Ruth* admitted by you, more Canonical Scripture, than that of *Judith* which you reject. Did any Martyr ever yet dye in defence of *Salomons Canticle* (that Scripture say you) and refuse to dye for the Book of *Wisdom*, cast out of your Canon? Or was ever any soul sooner converted by reading the One, than the other? These *Miracles* Sir, these *Martyrdoms*, these *Conversions* immediately illustrate the Church, and prove not à Part only but Her whole Doctrine to be most *Evidently Credible*, and worthy of belief, whilst you see your Signs of Divinity and no man knowes what imagined motives in behalf of Scripture, as little Evidence the Books you admit, as those you reject, *That* *u*, neither indeed have any *Self-Evidence* in them, abstracting from Church Authority. Your Evidence therefore is à strong fancy and nothing else.

12. But admit one had Evident Motives for the whole Canon or bare letter of Scripture, you have not any so much as probable for the Sense (chiefly in Controuerted matters) which properly is God's Revelation, without the Churches *infallible*

Inter-

No Motives  
for the Scrip-  
tures Sense.

Without the  
Churches  
Infallible  
interpreta-  
tion.

Our Adver-  
sary missta-  
ken.

The Infalli-  
ble Tradition  
for the bare  
letter.

Interpretation. Speak, Sr, your Conscience plainly, What can induce you or me, to know that the Book we read is God's (being innumerable false Religions by peruerse Misinter-pretations are drawn from thence) if that other Principle. Deus loquitur; God, or Truth it self speaks *This* and *this* particular Book, has in darkness concealed from vs. This Principle then, *that God's this Sense*, being the very ultimate Resoluent and last Foundation of Christian Faith, must, when that Sense is Obscure, borrow Light from no dark mistaken fallible or doubtful Oracle: But the bare letter of Scripture is dark, and grossly mistaken by Heretiques, mans private Iudgement is fallible, our comparing the Scriptures Passages together, is meerly Coniectural, and dubious. Therefore if the certitude of Faith must rely vpon what God has spoken (I mean the infallible Sense of this sacred word) The Oracle which interprets, can be no other but an infallible Church. And here I both Petition and vrge Sectarians to assign any other Surer Ground where vpon Faith can be built, being all confests we are obliged to belieue that Infallible Sense, chiefly in matters they call Fundamental. This Argument alone could we say no more, forceth every rational man to own a Church absolutely infallible in Her exposition of Scripture.

23. From whence also it follows first, that Mr Scillingfleet much mistakes Himself, when he saith. *Both sides I hope agree, that there are sufficient Motives of Credibility, as to the belief of Scripture.* I answer. There is not one firm Motiue for the true revealed Sense (and this only is Scripture) if we exclude Tradition, and the infallible Interpretation of Gods Church. Bring to light but one, and I am satisfied.

24. It follows. 2. That, that half Tradition owned by Sectarians in order to the conueyance and deliuey of the Books of Scripture, leaves them wholly Scriptureles, and as Faithless as if they had no Bible. For it neither grounds faith immediately, because it is not Gods Revelation, but the fallible Consent of men; Nor can it induce as a Motiue to belieue any one particular



Not suffi-  
cient.

ticular Article of Christian Religion, without further ceremony had from the same Churches infallible Tradition and interpretation, concerning that most weighty Point of the Scriptures meaning. Reject therefore this infallible Interpreter, All of us iust like Arians, Macedonians, Donatists, desperately rely vpon the worst Guides Imaginable, our own fallacious and vngouernable fancies, and will needs learn of such giddy Teachers, the true interpretation of Gods Word. These we make our Oracles in lieu of Christs Church, and in doing so, may easily ascribe to God a Doctrin he disdain's to own, and become Heretiques by it. The very hazard men run in this wilful Course, is an open Iniury to the Supreme Verity, vnauoidable in our Sectaries Principles.

Sectaries  
pernicious  
Doctrin.

Concerning  
the Clearness  
of Scripture.

15. And here by the way, you se the Vanity of that pernicious Doctrin published by them, wherewith the world is cheated. Viz. *The Sense of Scripture is plain enough, even to the vnlearned, in things necessary to Salvation*; in other matters not necessary, *a right Faith an verring Guide*, an infallible Interpreter, Seem vfeles and superfluous, As if forsooth, the Arians, Pelagians, Nestorians, had not grossly erred in Points most necessary, though they read the same plain Scripture, which we all read. Did then that supposed Clearness nothing secure them from Heresy in Necessaries? Why should it, I beseech you, rescue Sectaries (wholly as fallible) from gross errours in other matters, when the words of Scripture are more expresse against them, than against the worst of Arians. But hereof enough is said aboue.

The Roman  
Catholick  
only has Sta-  
bility in  
Faith.

16. It followes. 3. That no Christian has stability in Faith but the Roman Catholick, for the most which others, no members of this Church, can know (if yet they know so much) is, That the Books of Scripture are Gods word, but with this last piece of imperfect Learning, they neither know nor can believe one particular Article of Christian Faith, because that other Principle, the last Refoluent of all Belief, *God speaks infallibly this very Sense*, has no influence ouer their Assent, and therefore is rejected by them as impertinent to ground Faith vpon. One

influence

None will giue you more light.

The Arian and Protestant agree thus farr, That those  
*John. 1. 5. 9. Three giue Testimony in heauen &c.* are Di-  
 one Scripture, yet so vary about the meaning, and the diffe-  
 rence is in a matter most fundamental, that the One Assent's  
 to the sacred Trinity for these words, which yet the Other im-  
 piously denies. Say now, vpon what infallible Principle doth  
 the Protestants faith stand more firm, than that of the Arian?  
 Will Mr Stillingfleet say the Scripture is Clear? The Arian  
 takes him off that Plea, and endeauours to obscure the passage,  
 by adding to it no small number of his Arian Glosses. Next  
 he Argues thus *ad hominem*, and thinks no wrong at all done.  
 Can yee Sectaries belieue that your glosses laid vpon those  
 Scriptures which Catholicks produce against you, are strong  
 enough to diuert, and peruert the Sense or Interpretation of  
 the Vniuersal Church, and shall my glosses opposit to your  
 Doctrin, haue no force to diuert or weaken the late, priuate,  
 iudged Sense of a few Lutherans? What law is there for  
 this? I call it *late* and *priuate* as it comes from you, for you  
 dissent to ground it vpon any Church Authority absolutly in-  
 fallible, in all She teaches. Therefore it is your own Priuate  
 Sense, and not the Churches. O but the Church of Rome in  
 this particular interpret's Scripture faithfully, though She err's in  
 other matters. Pitiful. That is, She hitt's right when You'll  
 giue leave, and misses when you think otherwise.

18. One may Say again. The whole Orthodox world euer  
 poued the Mysterious Trinity from that alleged Passage of  
 Scripture. *Contra*, Replies the Arian, I, and my Adherents who  
 deny the Mytery, hold our Selues as precious a Part of the  
 Orthodox world as you Protestants doe, And hope we expound  
 Scripture by the help of our priuate Reasoning and comparing  
 Text together, as well as you. Why not I beseech you? Or  
 giue a Disparity. But say on, And the contest is ended. Ha-  
 ue you any Oracle, which more infallibly Ascertain's you of that  
 sense of Scripture to be as you gloss, then we haue who giue

*Both Ariani  
 and Pro-  
 testants  
 want a Sta-  
 bility.*

*And why?*

*How the A-  
 rian argues  
 against So-  
 cianes.*

*His Ar-  
 gument Con-  
 uincet.*

492 Disc. 3. C. 3. Mr Stilling: fifth Chapter &c.

it a quite contrary Interpretation, For hitherto we are both alike, and expound all by our primate Iudgements. Gaze such an Oracle (Distinct from Scripture) whereby you haue Assurance of God's meaning darkly expressed in those words, you become plane Papists; Own not Any Infalible, you cast your Selues vpon as great Vncertainties as we Arians are thrown, who expound Scripture by our own natural Discourse. No infalible Church therefore, no Stability in faith, no Stability in faith, that specious word of an *Orthodox World* Signifies nothing, For this I Defend, and haue Proued it, if all Churches be fallible in their Definitions, there neither is, nor euer was since Christs time any such thing in being, as an *Orthodox World*.

No Orthodox  
world, wi-  
thout an  
Infalible  
Church.

The distinct  
Marks of  
true Belie-  
uers, and  
All Hetero-  
doks.

19. It follows. 4. That as it has euer been the proper Mark or Character of all faithful Belieuers to yeild Submission to the Churches Doctrin, though weak reason conceiues it difficult, so Contrarywise, stubbornly to resist Church Authority has euer been inseparably the Mark and Badge of all Heteroques, whether ancient or modern. With this virulent Spirit they began to Oppose God's Oracle, and held on for a time, But as *S. Austin* obserues at last ended in shame *Controversies*, saith the Saint, the battered Rock of the Catholick hitherto stand's firm, maugre that Violence, And their Scattered forces routed and broken, as experience tells vs, are brought to nothing.

CHAP. III.

*More of this subject. Objections Answered. A word to  
Mr Stillingfleets forceless Instances. Motives of  
credibility ever Precede Faith. Whether  
the rational Evidence of the Truth  
of Christ's Doctrin, can be a  
Motive to believe it.*

**W**HAT follows in Mr Stillingfleets. 3. or. 4. next Pages, seem's so slight that the very most is refuted by the grounds already established, Yet to Comply with the mans humour, we must follow him further. How Saith He *can you make the assent to your Churches Testimony to be infallible, when the infallibility is accepted to be proved only by the motives of Credibility?* I answer. Just as you make the Assent of the Primitive Christians given to the Apostles preaching infallible, So I make the Assent to the Churches Testimony infallible. The Motives are alike in both Cases, if not greater for the Church.

*The first  
Arguments  
reverted.*

2. He Objects. 2. *If Divine Faith, cannot be built vpon the Motives proving the Doctrin of Christ, what sense is there that it should be built vpon these Motives, which prove our Churches infallibility* Here is the old Mistake again. I Answer therefore, Divine Faith is not built vpon the Motives inducing to believe, but vpon the infallible Testimony of Christ, and his Church. The Motives ground the Iudgement of Credibility, The Infallible Testimony Support's Divine Faith. Now if by this word, *Built*, you mean no more but rationally, *To induce*, I say none in this present State can be induced to believe Christ's Doctrin revealed in Scripture, in case he reject's the Authority of that evidenced Church

*The second  
is a gross  
Mistake.*

Q99.3

which

494 Disc. 2. C. 3. *More of this Subject.*

*The third  
retorted, and  
answered.*

which both Ascertain him of the Canon, and the Sense also. Hence, That other Objection falls to nothing. *How can there be an infallible Assent to the truth of this Proposition: Scripture is the Word of God, when that Infallibility at the highest is but evidently Credible?* I Answer and retort the Argument. How could the Primitive Christians Assent to the Apostles preaching as infallible, when that *infallibility* at the highest, was but Evidently Credible, before they believed?

*A Discovery  
of the whole  
Fallacy.*

3. The whole Confusion lies, as is said, in not Distinguishing between Faith, and the Judgement of Credibility. *Infallibility* therefore, whether we Assent to Christ, to his Apostles, or to the Church (all taught one and the same Doctrine) is the Object of Divine Faith, but none ever assented to any Doctrine these Oracles taught, *infallibly*, without sufficient Evidence previously had of its Credibility. And thus I believe by Faith Scripture to be God's word, because the Church Saith so, But if you Ask, why I hold all the Church Teaches to be *Evidently Credible*, I Euince not this truth by the *Infallibility* I believe, But recur to those Motives whereby She is proued an Oracle as evidently Credible, as euer any Apostle was, And consequently I believe Her *Infallibility* with the same Divine Faith, as I believe the Words of Scripture.

4. Page 114. He Objects. 3. *We Catholics make by this Way of resolving Faith every man's reason the only Judge in the Choice of his Religion.* Why doe we more so, I beseech you, than the Primitive Christians, who certainly had the very like rational Motives with ours, and no other, before they believed? But of this Subject we shall treat largely towards the End of this Discourse.

*Objections  
grounded on  
Instance.*

5. Page. 115. He Saith. *If the Infallibility of the Church of Rome, be a iure foundation of Faith, what Will become of the Faith, of all those who receiued Divine Revelations, without the Infallibility of any Church at all?* And he brings in these Instances. First, of the Apostles believing the Divine Authority of the old Testament when Christ suffered, which certainly was not Grounded on the infallible Testimony of the

the Church, for at that time is consented to the Death of the  
 2. Of all that believed the woman of Samaria (no infal-  
 lible Oracle) when She declared the Discourse between Christ our  
 Lord and her self. 3. Of such as believed our Sauours Doctrin  
 and Miracles related by men honest and faithful. These, Saith  
 he, had no infallible Testimony, but only a rational Evidence to build Faith  
 upon, and consequently an Infallible Testimony of the Concurryers of Diuine  
 Revelation is unnecessary to Diuine Faith, which seem's vndoubted,  
 For very few in the first Ages of the Christian Church recei-  
 ued the Doctrin of the Gospel, from the mouths of persons in-  
 fallible.

6. By the way I much wonder, Why Mr Stillingfleet omitted  
 to touch here vpon an other Instance farr more difficult, which  
 both he and all other must solue concerning rude and illiterate  
 Persons (chiefly if of no great maturity) who are induced to  
 believe by the Testimony, or Instruction of their Parents, or of  
 some other simple Teachers. These certainly may haue Faith,  
 without acquiring that full Evidence of Credibility whereunto  
 the learned reach, yea, and without any Discouery of the Scrip-  
 tures rational Evidence, neuer perhaps heard of, much less vnder-  
 stood by them.

*Another In-  
 stance more  
 difficult.*

7. Now I Answer to the Obiection. None makes the  
 Roman Catholick Church in all Circumstances the only sure  
 foundation of Diuine Faith, For the first man that believed in  
 Christ our Lord before the Compleat Establishment of His Church,  
 had Perfect Faith resting on that great Master of Truth, without  
 dependance on the Christian Church, For Christ alone was not  
 the Church, But the supreme Head of it: Faith therefore in  
 General requires no more, but only to rely vpon God the first  
 Prins speaking by this or that Oracle, by one or more men  
 lawfully sent to teach, who proue their Mission and make the  
 Doctrin proposed by them *Evidently Credible*. In like manner,  
 the Apostles preached no Doctrin in the name of the new  
 Christian Church, whilst our Sauour liued here on earth, But  
 Testified that he was the true Messias by virtue of those Signs  
 and

*The Church  
 in all Cir-  
 cumstances  
 was not the  
 only Foun-  
 dation of  
 Faith.*



and Miracles, which had been already wrought about the force of nature. Thus much Supposed.

*The Mistake  
of the first  
Instance.*

8. It is hard I think for any to Say, where the force lies in that Instance of the Apostles believing the Divine Authority of the old Testament, which innumerable Jewes then dispersed all Iury over, and the other parts of the world (not at all conscious of Christ's Passion) most firmly believed. - Why therefore might not the Apostles believe the Divinity of the old Scripture upon the Authority of that Church, whereof there were at that time many and very many Professors in other places distant from Hierusalem? Hence I say the Belief of that Article never failed, But was alwayes preserved entire in both Churches of the Jewes and Christians, for we all yet believe the Authority of the old Testament, And Consequently its hard to Conceive what this Objection aymes at.

*Supposed  
true its  
forcales.*

9. Again, admit à total Subuersion of the Jewish Church, Had not the Apostles our Blessed Lord present who could well Ascertain them that he came not to Cancel any Divine Authority of Scripture (for this was impossible unless God be contrary to God) but to fulfil, to perfect, and change the old Law into à better State. O but the High Priest and the Elders also erred in consenting to Christs death. Very true, and the Reason is because their Priuiledge of not erring, lasted only to Christs coming and not longer, But hence it follows not, that then there was no Jewish Church which believed the true Verities of the old Scripture. I verily think, Mr Scillingham mistook one Obiection for another. Perhaps he would have said, that the Apostles lost faith of our Saviours Resurrection, at the time of his Passion, But this Difficulty is solved over and over. First it is Answered, that Article was not sufficiently Proposed to them, Therefore we read. Luke. 18. 34. They understood none of these things. This word was hid from them. Again, Had they failed in Faith at that time, They were then as Belarmin observes. Lib. 3. de Ecclesia. C. 17. neither the whole Church (but only material Parts of it) nor could that impen-

*The Apostles  
failed not in  
Faith.*

bible

late Supposed Error, have prejudiced one whit the Faith of others, who firmly believed in Christ.

10. That other Instance of the Samaritan woman is soon cleared, if we distinguish between the Motive, or the natural Proposition of Faith which comes by hearing, and the infallible Oracle whereupon it relies, And 'Tis strange Mr Stillingfleet saw not the Distinction. The Faith therefore of those other Samaritans that believed in Christ vpon the womans word, Visually relyed vpon our Saviours own Authority who had conversed with her, And hence the Gospel sayes. Now we believe for thy saying, for we our selves haue heard, and know, that this man, in very deed, is the Saviour of the World. This we had this woman, whom the Fathers Suppose perfectly conversed to Christ, been made an Infallible Oracle in all she delivered, as the Apostles were in their Teaching, or the Church now is. Her Testimony might well haue supported Faith, but because thus much only can be euinced by Scripture, that She seriously Proposed what She had heard of our Saviour, Her testimony alone might serue well as a natural Proposition to raise Belief in others, though insufficient to ground in them that Supernatural Assent, And her words had vpon this Account greater weight, because She confirmed them with a Sign aboue the force of Nature. This man has told me all I haue done. I know some Authors are of opinion, that this Samaritan called Photina first reduced to the Faith of Christ her Sisters and Children, which done She went into Affrica, and there Propagated the Christian Doctrin with great Success, till at last both She and her Children were crowned with a glorious Martyrdom. The only Question is, whether She be the same with that S. Photina whose memory is kept in the Roman Martyrologe the 20. day of March, some Greek Authors stand for the Affirmative, Be it so or other wise, it imports little to our present Purpose. Who desires more of this Subject may read the erudite Godefridus Henricus. Tom. 3. de Sanctis Martij die. 20. immediately after the life of S. Ioachim.

The other Instance cleared, by one Distinction.

The Samaritan woman proposed what She had heard,

Different Opinions Concerning her.

*Other Instances  
Should for-  
celes.*

*In Doctrin  
Commonly  
received.*

11. Conformable to this Doctrin we Answer to these other forceles Instances, and might say with some good Divines, That all Immediate Propounders or Conueyers of Diuine Reuelation in such particular Cases, need not ro be Infallible, For Faith (as These Diuines Teach) requires no more; But first that the Object be truly reuealed, and Proposed to one vpon prudent Motiues, Suitable to the firm Assent Hee must elicit. 2. That by the light of such Motiues Hee be induced to fix Belief vpon the Diuine Reuelation, although that full Euidence of Credibility which the Church Manifesteth and the more learned attain to, be not yet acquired by him. These Conditions presupposed, Diuine Grace is euer ready to make that mans Faith most firm and supernatural, And consequently an Obligation lies on him to belieue. But from this Doctrin which is Common, no such thing followes as Mr Stillingsf. would infer. Viz. That the Churches infallibility Seem's vnecessary to vphold infallible Faith, for may not young Beginners growing more mature (chiefly if solicited to abandon Their first Faith) iustly demand to haue more full Satisfaction in all their doubts, and so much Assurance concerning that they once assented to, as not to be remoued from it vpon any false Motiues or fallacious Arguments, though neuer so Specious? Such cases (Say these) fall out euery day.

*The Chur-  
ches Infalli-  
bility absolu-  
tely necessa-  
ry.*

12. But in this present State, none can clear these doubts, none can Assure any that his Faith is certainly true, none can bring the most learned to a perfect acquiescency in Belief, but an Infallible Church, Therefore vpon this very Account Her infallibility is proued not only *conuenient*, but absolutely *Necessary*. And hence it is, That Gods sacred Providence neuer failed since Christianity began, to haue in readines Some one or other infallible known Oracle, wherevpon faith might rest most Securely. The Apostles had for their Master the best liuing Oracle, *Christ our Lord*. The Primitive Christians learned of the Apostles. After them the Church perfectly founded did succeed, as the only Oracle wherevnto euery one may take recourse

For further Satisfaction when difficulties arise, Though in some particular Cases, as is now Said, Her Motiues and glorious Miracles, be not at the first laid forth most fully to every simple Belieuer. *Ceteram tuam*, saith S. Austin, *consequitur*. C. 4. *non intelligendi rinacitas, sed credendi simplicitas*. That is. Candid Simplicity, makes these more easy than curiously to search into the vltimate grounds of Believing. The Reason is, because fewer Motiues (if yet prudent and Conuincing) may well serue to induce Beginners, seldom needed with Difficulties against Faith, than will conuince Others more learned, who often struggle to Captiuat their Vnderstanding, when the high Mysteries of Christianity are Proposed.

How young  
Beginners  
are drawn.

11. Moreouer, many great Doctors maintain, that in the particular cases now mentioned, God by his special Illumination supplies the want of the exteriour Proposition when that's deficient, or less conuincing. See Suarez. *Disp. 4. de Fide sect. 5.* and this way also, we easily solue Mr Stillingfleets difficulties. Lastly it is noted in the other Treatise. *Disc. 1. C. 2. n. 5. 16.* That whoeuer is lawfully sent to teach the Christian doctrine, and deliueis those Truths in the name of God and his Church, is considered, as a member conuoynd with Christs infallible Oracle, He may be Said to teach infallibly. The Reasons you have here giuen more largely.

Two Solu-  
tions more.

And both re-  
crimed Do-  
ctrin.

14. I am now to retort Mr Stillingfleets Instances vpon himself and show, That though he walk's neuer so far abroad to now the several Plantations of Faith amongst either Britains or Barbarians, he must solue his own difficulties. Thus I discourse. We now Suppose, All these Barbarians Conuerted to Christ would had true Faith, and Consequently prudent Motiues to believe, before they firmly assented to the Diuine Reuelation. We make Enquiry after these, and Ask: By what Inducements were such as yet knew not our Sauour, drawn to believe in him? Mr Stillingfleet return's the strangest Answer I euer heard, For he seem's to make his Motiues inducing to Faith nothing

These in-  
stances re-  
toried.

What our  
Adversary  
but asserts.

*but the rational Evidence of the truth of the Doctrine delivered, and Therefore grievously complains. P. 118. That we deliver the Obligation to Faith, which ariseth from the rational Evidence of Christian Religion. If this be not pure Fancy there was never any, and my Reason is. That Supposed rational Evidence, is either the very same with the intrinsecal Verity of the Doctrine delivered, or a rational intellectual Light distinct from the Doctrine. If it be the very same, These truths simply Proposed. Christ is God and man, Adam infected his posterity with Original Sin, and a unit Essence and three Persons, are without more their own Self-evidences, and consequently all the Miracles which Christ and his Apostles wrought to settle these, and the like Verities firm in the Primitive Believers; were to as little Purpose, as if one should raise the dead to persuade us that the Sun shines, or (if we speak of Moral certainty) that there have been such men in the world as Pompey and Ishmael Caesar, which is enormously untrue.*

*His rational  
Evidence of  
Christian  
Religion*

*Rebeld,*

*Andratoried.*

15. Contrariwise if he Saith, This rational Evidence necessarily implies a previous intellectual Discourse grounded on prudent Motives, distinct from the Verity of Christs Doctrine. He first cashier's his own fancied Evidence. And 2. maketh Answer to the Instances proposed, And. 3. Assent to this true vniuersal Proposition. *Viz. That neuer any belient, or able belient (if we abstract from private Reuelations) without Motives distinct from Christs Doctrine, (set to induce Faith) And an infallible Testimony to ground Faith vpon.* Thus the Samaritan woman, and those who heard her Relation, being first induced by precedent signes to iudge that Christ was a Prophet. 1. *prophet thou art* a Prophet Saies the Text (and perhaps his Goodness added more interieur light to strengthen those Signes) firmly believed vpon his infallible word. *Iesus said to her I am he (the Messias) that speaks with thee.* Neither can any Instance be given where true Faith is, But you haue with that very Faith, Prudent Motives Proposed to reason, as Inducements, and besides an infallible Oracle so ground it vpon. Q. but every immediate

*Prudent Mo-  
tives and an  
Infallible  
Oracle.  
Necessary to  
all Faith.*

But Propounder of the Divine Testimony is not infallible. He is at present, What matters that? If he leads me to one which gives me a clearer Evidence of Credibility, and Himself by Motives above the force of nature, God's

Some thing of this nature we have in the first Conversion of Christs Disciples John. 1. 44. Philip, Saith the Son, meeting with Nathanaël told him. *We have found Jesus of Nazareth, whom Moses in the Law and the Prophets* Nathanaël wondred. *What can there be any good from Nazareth?* Philip answered. *Veni & vide.* Come and se. Having neer He vnderstood that our Saviour knew his Intentions, *where in there was no Guile*, and beheld him vnder the figures before he was called: Thus enlightened by Signs about the natural knowledge of man, forthwith that true Profession of his Faith followed. *Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel.* In like manner it may easily fall out, if one not very learned treat with another wholly illiterate (yet naturally honest) that has heard little of Christ or his Church, He who would instruct, Sayes no more, *But, Veni & vide.* Come I will bring you to an Oracle right able to teach you, we call it the Catholick Church, She can show you who laid Her foundations firm. She will convince your vnderstanding by the efficacy of such Motives, (*Miracles, Conversions, and length of life*) which far surpass the power of natural causes. Now after you have seen and heard what I Say to be most true, Believe not vpon my word (for I only point at the Oracle) but vpon the Churches own Testimony, She is without Guile, and cannot deceiue you.

*A Proof taken from the Conversions of Christ's Disciples.*

*The Application.*

And here by the way you se how differently the Sectary and Catholick proceed, in the Conversions of an Vnbeliever, whether Heathen or other. The first only open's a Bible, and without further Motives but what are found therein, bids him read the Book. This yet vnconverted man Saies the sense is dark, He vnderstand's it not. The Catholick on

*How differently the Catholick Doctors, and Sectaries proceed.*



*In the Conversion of Vobeliensers.*

the other side, Proposes à Church evidenced by the very same Marks and Signes, whereby our Sauour and his Apostles were manifested to be Oracles sent from God. This Church both proues that the Bible is of Diuine Inspiration, And moreover declares its Sense in all controuerted Passages. Finally after Her Motiues laid forth, She remit's euery one to Christs own words, *He that hears you hears me*, and our Sauour remit's us to his Eternal Father, for he Assures all. *Iohn. 7. 16. That the Doctrine deliuered by him was not his, but his Fathers that sent him.* And here is the last ground of all Diuine Faith, which stand's fast vpon three strong Principles neuer yet at variance with one another. *The Church, Christ our Lord, and God the first Person.* Consider I beseech you which of the two Teachers proceed's more rationally.

*The Instances of Barbarians brought to nothing, For suppose first, which some Authors assert, that S. Peter Prince of the Apostles Preached in Brittain or England, Or that S. Paul, Simon Cananaw surnamed the Zealous, Aristobulus à Roman, and S. Ioseph of Arimathea performed that Apostolical function there; (whether so or no I dispute not). Suppose again, And herein all agree, that England receiued the Christian faith very early, For it is as certain that King Lucius and his Subjects, were conuerted by S. Damian and his Associates, sent to preach by that holy Pope and Martyr Elutberius about one hundred and eighty years after Christ; As it is indubitable, that the English Saxons were afterward Conuerted by S. Augustin and his followers sent by S. Gregory the great in the six Century, to do that most worthy and laudable Duty. Vpon these Suppositions you see that the first Preachers were Apostolical men, and priuiledged by our Sauour to work Miracles, Mark. 16. 20. Those others in the two following Conversions receiued their Commission from Popes, held a strict Vnion with the Roman Catholick Church, and finally made their Doctrine evidently Credible by great Sanctity, and other Signal wonders, as known History recounts.*

*The reason here of.*

18. You see moreover those Instances of the Brittain and Barbarians brought to nothing, For suppose first, which some Authors assert, that S. Peter Prince of the Apostles Preached in Brittain or England, Or that S. Paul, Simon Cananaw surnamed the Zealous, Aristobulus à Roman, and S. Ioseph of Arimathea performed that Apostolical function there; (whether so or no I dispute not). Suppose again, And herein all agree, that England receiued the Christian faith very early, For it is as certain that King Lucius and his Subjects, were conuerted by S. Damian and his Associates, sent to preach by that holy Pope and Martyr Elutberius about one hundred and eighty years after Christ; As it is indubitable, that the English Saxons were afterward Conuerted by S. Augustin and his followers sent by S. Gregory the great in the six Century, to do that most worthy and laudable Duty. Vpon these Suppositions you see that the first Preachers were Apostolical men, and priuiledged by our Sauour to work Miracles, Mark. 16. 20. Those others in the two following Conversions receiued their Commission from Popes, held a strict Vnion with the Roman Catholick Church, and finally made their Doctrine evidently Credible by great Sanctity, and other Signal wonders, as known History recounts.

19. Some may reply. All these Conversions would have been easily wrought, had those Preachers only made our Saviours Miracles known, and done none Themselves. I Answer first, Done they were and prejudiced nothing, but rather highly advanced the Glory of our Saviours wonders, Yea and as experience teaches, yet notably facilitate the Conversion of Infidels every where, when God is pleased to work them by his Servants. Therefore the Apostles were impowred not only to Testify that the Messiah did Miracles, but moreouer to do the like themselves, And for this reason, Almighty God has euer hitherto preserved, and will hereafter preserve that singular Grace of working Miracles in the Church. I Answer 2. None can have infallible Assurance either of our Saviours Miracles, or of any other Verity recorded in Scripture, independently of some actual living, actual infallible, and most clear evidenced Oracle by: Signes about the face of Nature, which in this present State is the Church, And therefore I said a great Truth, That Diuine Faith had in all Ages that necessary Expedient. of rational Motiues to induce it, an Infallible Oracle to teach it, and finally to rely on.

A Reply  
Answered.

Prudent  
Motiues in-  
duce to  
Faith and  
An Infalli-  
ble Oracle  
support it.

20. Hence we easily Answer Mr Stillingfleets Question. P. 118. What, saith he, cannot men have unquestionable Assurance that there was such a Person as Christ in the World who dyed for vs, if the present Church be not infallible. Answ. You might, Sr, haue proposed a wiser Question. Know I beseech you That in the forenamed Proposition. There was such a Man as Christ who lived in the World, and dyed for vs, Two things may be Considered. First, That the man called Christ dyed on a Cross, And this Verity, as we sayd above, Once visible, both Iewes and Gentils yet Assent to vpon Moral Certainty, but therefore do not believe in Christ. The Reason is Manifest (and it utterly destroyes your Doctrin) because that Common report, or Moral Certainty is not God's infallible Reuelation, which only can support Faith.

An un-  
derstand-  
ed Obiection  
answered.

21. The second thing to be considered is. That the man called Christ dying for vs, was the only Messiah, truly God, the Redeemer of Mankind. Here you haue the hidden Verities of Christian

504 Disc. 3. C. 3. *More of this Subject etc.*

Christian Religion, the Certain Objects of Faith Commed to vs, by no Moral Assurance but solely vpon Gods Infallible Reuelation, whereof more presently.

22. Page. 119. He tell's vs first. We cannot say, what or where that Church is which we suppose infallible. Nor. 2. What is that Church is the proper Subject of infallibility. Nor. 3. What kind of Infallibility this is. Nor. 4. How we can know when the Church Desires infallibly. Here is very slight Matter to work on. To the first we Answer. The Church, which we do not barely suppose, but haue already proued Infallible, is that diffused Society of Christians (vnited in one Faith vnder one Head) which is most discernable from all Societies, by the same euident Marks of truth, that Christ and his Apostles manifested to the world. To the. 2. We haue both Answered and retorted the Argument in the other Treatise, where it is Said. The Church may be considered, First as it is *Decent, or Teaching*, And thus Her *Representative moral Body*, the Pope, I mean and Council assembled together, for the Reasons alleged. Chap. 17. is the proper Subject of Infallibility: Again if we consider the Church as it is *Dispers*, learning, or taught, All those diffused multitudes of Christians that are vnited in one belief, and own due Submission to their lawful Pastors, because they belieue as the Church Representative teaches, may be rightly stiled vpon the Account of their infallible Faith, the proper Subject of Infallibility. And must nor our Adversaries who hold a Society of men infallible in Fundamentals solve this Difficulty, and Declare in what Subject that half Infallibility is lodged? To the. 3. we haue Answered. Chap. 16. This infallibility which proceed's from the Special Assistance of the Holy Ghost, is of such a Nature, That that Blessed Spirit will neuer permit the Church *infallibly*, to Define a falshood, nor the *instructed*, Vniuersally to fall in with. To the. 4. I Answer. Then we know the Church Desires infallibly, when She obliges all vnder *Anathemas*, to belieue her Doctrine, and when the Doctrine is so sufficiently proposed to her Subjects, that it cannot be morally doubted of. But enough of these

The true  
Church  
denoted.

The subject  
of Infalli-  
bility.

From  
whence In-  
fallibility  
Proceed's?

Strengthles difficulties, examined and solved à hundred times over. May better be expected hereafter? We shall see that in the following Chapter.

## CHAP. IV.

*Of Mr Stillingfleets Errours. Of that odd kind of Faith he seem's to maintain, grounded on Moral Certainty. What Influence the Motives of Credibility haue vpon Faith? Other Parcels of his Doctrin Examined, and refuted. Obiections Solued.*

**A**FTER Mr Stillingfleet had said, All may haue vnquestionable Assurance of our Sauours once being in the world, though the present Church were fallible, He tells vs again, that the Assurance of the matters of fact, which are the foundations of Faith, is necessary, in order to the obligation to believe, And then adds, I mean such an assurance as matters of fact are capable of, so no higher can be required than the nature of the things will bear. He goes on in his Ignorance. Cannot we haue vnquestionable Assurance, that there were such persons as Caesar and Pompey without some infallible Testimony? If we may in such things, Why not in other Matters of fact, which infinitely more concern vs, though the Church stamp not on Infallibility vpon them? The man you see would say, That these verities. Christ dyed for vs, is our only Redeemer, truly God and man, being Matters of fact, and foundations of Faith, are conueyed to vs vpon no higher certainty than Moral Certainty, For the nature of them, iust like that Assurance we haue of a Caesar, and Pompey, bear's no greater. Hence he also tells

*Mr Stilling-  
fleets  
Doctrin.*

Explained  
by himselfe

The Doc-  
trin is dan-  
gerous

And Proued  
Most erro-  
neous,

A two fold  
Proposition,

All Teachers  
of Christian  
Doctrin  
conueyed is  
Infallibly.

vs. P. 106. that Moral certainty, may be as great as Mathematical and Physical, Supposing as little reason to doubt in moral things, as their Nature, as in Mathematical and Physical, as to theirs. And afterward. There can be no greater than this Moral Certainty, of the main foundations of all Religion. Reflect Christian Reader. But the Verities now mentioned. *Christ is our Redeemer. The only Messias, truly God and Man,* are the main foundations of Christian Religion, And Conueyed to vs by moral certainty, Therefore Mr Scillingfleet laies the whole weight of Christian Religion, hitherto held infallibly true, vpon a certainty which may be false. By this confused and vndigested Discourse, I hope all will perceiue, what it is to write Controuerfies, with half an Insight into Difficulties.

2. I proue it first both indigested and erroneous by this undeniable Principle. No Authority in Heauen or earth deliuered these Verities (*Christ is the true Messias. Christ is God and Man*) vpon Moral Certainty only, Ergo, None can belieue them with so weak an Assent, as is only Moral. The Consequence is clear, For if no Authority conueyed or deliuered the Verities as Morally certain only, And I Assent to them with à Belieue only Morally Certain, my Assent is giuen to some Authority which hath no Being either in Heauen or earth. Or, Argue thus, and you Copuince. If all Authority Imaginable, wherevpon Faith can depend, Conueyed or deliuered these Verities both as Infallible Truths, and infallibly, And I Assent to the Doctrin with à Belieue not infallible, but only morally Certain, I leaue by my fallible moral Assent, the true Infallible teaching and Conueying Oracles of Christian Doctrin, and belieue vpon à meer fancied Authority, which was neuer impowred to Conuey God's Verities to any.

3. Now that all Authority (wherevpon Faith can depend) deliuered the forementioned Verities Infallibly, is Manifest. God's Reuelation, was and is infallible. Christ our Lord and the Apostles taught these Doctrins Infallibly. The Orthodox Church, Disclaim's this petty way of conueying and teaching Chris-

Doctrin fallibly. Therefore No Authority can be conceiv-  
ed, which deliuered such Verities (owned euen by Sectaries essen-  
tial Doctrins) vpon Moral Certainly only, or Conueyed them  
fallibly to Any.

4. Hence you se first. This Dilemma cannot be Answered.  
Either we belieue, That our Sauour is the *true Messias* (the like  
is of all other Mysteries) because God reuealed it, And because  
Christ himselfe, His Apostles, and the Vniuersal Church euer  
since taught the Doctrin; Or Contrarywise, we belieue it vpon  
some other Authority Inferiour *to*, and distinct *from* the Infalli-  
ble Testimony of these Oracles. Grant the first, our Faith  
stand's firm vpon à Testimony both Diuine and Infallible, and  
therefore Cannot but be Infallible. Say. 2. We belieue vpon  
another Authority distinct from the Testimony of the Oracles  
now named, that misplaced Assent, because not resoluable into  
the first Verity, is no Faith at all.

*A Dilemma*

5. You se. 2. Whoener attempt's to turn these high reuea-  
led Verities out of their onw nature of being Infallible, Or  
rashly presumes, to conuey that Doctrin to vs vpon Moral cer-  
tainty only, which God by Diuine Reuelation, Christ our Lord,  
The Apostles also deliuered and Conueyed, as most infallible  
certain Doctrin, Becomes thereby à publick Corrupter of Di-  
uine Truths vpon this account, that He transfigures what the  
first Verity has spoken Infallibly, into weak Topicks and vn-  
certain Moralities. The Offence is Criminal, and the wrong  
done to God not pardonable, without à serious Repentance.

*A 2. Infe-  
rence,*

6. You se. 3. That No Authority Imaginable vphold's this  
pretended Moral Certainty of Sectaries in Matters of Faith.  
And here I desire Mr Stillingsfleet to Answer. Will he belieue  
that Christ our Lord is the true Messias, God and man, becau-  
se All Orthodox Christians assent to the Verity? I Answer  
first. All these belieue the truth with infallible Faith, and why  
dore not he do so also? 2. If he Assent's because they Vniuer-  
sally consent to the Mystery, He build's his Faith not vpon  
God's Infallible Reuelation, but vpon the Assent of Others

*No Autho-  
rity conser-  
uable vpon  
hela's*

Sss 2

which



*This pretended moral Certainty.*

*where the main difficulty lies?*

*Moral certainty more rigidly examined,*

*Four things to be considered.*

which He saith Should only be moral, and fallible. 3. Will he believe the Verity because Heterodox Christians Iudge it true? That's neither God's Revelation, nor Christ's Doctrin, And Consequently his Faith has no foundation. 4. Will he believe for the Motiues of Credibility preuius to Faith? These considered as Motiues, are nor God's Revelation, Nor so much as Apostolical Doctrin. Besides as we Shall se presently, Protestants haue no Motiues at all to rely on. Finally will He tell vs, He believes that Christ was in the world and dyed on a Croſs, with the same Moral assent as He yeilds to the being of Cæsar and Pompey? I haue Answered, that's nothing to the Purpose, For Gentils assent to such Matters of Fact (once Visible and Sensible) by Moral Certainty, And yet are Infidels. That therefore which vrgeth at present, Concern's the *hidden and obscure Mysteries of Faith*, In these Moral Certainty hath no place at all. The reason is manifest For if as reuealed they stand firm vpon God's infallible Testimony, No Power vnder Heauen can alter their own intrinſick Infallibility, Or Conuey them vnto vs vpon weak Moral Certainty, yet Mr Stillingfleet boldly Assert's. *There can be no greater Certainty then Moral, of the Main foundations of all Religion.* Iudge good Reader, whether this be not a gross Mistake, And whether I wrong'd the man, when I told you his Discourse is vndigested, and highly erroneous.

7. Yet we haue not said all. Wherefore because Mr Stillingfleet seem's highly to value This late inuented Nouelty of Moral Certainty, we will examin the Doctrin most rigidly, till at last the whole fallacy be discovered. To do this, my first demand is, to what Obiect will He apply his Moral Certainty in this Matter of Fact? *Christ is theſeſſias truly God and man.* These four things and no more, can only be thought of. 1. The Maters believed. 2. The Diuine Testimony, which reueal's that Truth. 3. The Faith of those who believe vpon Revelation, And. 4. The Motiues whereby we are induced to believe the Truth reuealed, *because God speak's it.* Now all know first, that in Material Obiects purely considered in themselves, there neither is, nor

can

Disc. 3. C. 4. *More than Moral only.* 509

imbe-moral Certainty, For every thing is, or is not, independently of our Judgements, where only Moral certainty is founded, therefore God, and all those who se things intuitively, are exempted from this imperfect degree of Knowledge. 2. There can be no moral certainty in the Diuine Reuelation, which proceed's from an infinite Verity, for this without Question is most Supereminently Infallible. 3. If that infallible Testimony, or Reuelation be infallibly applied to Belieuers, and hath influence vpon their Faith, it cannot but transfuse into it infallible Certainty, if God Speak's infallibly, for this end that We belieue him infallibly, And if Faith rest not vpon that Perfection of his infallible Testimony, it is no Faith at all. Thus we Argued in the other Treatise. Disc. 1. C. 3. s. 7.

8. It remain's, that we now Say à word of the Motiues which induce to Faith, and examin what Influence they haue ouer it, when we either belieue the Doctrin in Scripture, or the Churches Definitions. Mr Stillingfleet. P. 203. Hauing first told vs, that the Reuelation which was communicated to one, was obligatory to all concerned in it, though they could haue nothing but moral certainty for it, Concludes thus. By this it appears, that when We now Speak of the resolution of Faith, though the utmost reason of our Assent be that Infallibility, which is supposed in the Diuine Testimony, yet the nearest and most proper Resolution of it, is into the Grounds inducing vs to belieue, That such à Testimony is truly Diuine, and the resolution of this cannot be into any Diuine Testimony, without à process in infinitum. He would Say, That à true act of Faith relies vpon two foundations, one remote, the supposed Diuine Testimony, The other most proper and nearest, To wit, the Grounds which induce to belieue, that such à Testimony is in being, or truly Diuine. And his reason (if he has any) must be, because these grounds, immediately Apply, or Conuey vnto vs the supposed Diuine Testimony. Now this Conueyance, or Application of the Testimony, being made by grounds only Morally certain, It followes, that the Faith we elicit Answer's not to the strength of the Testimonies Infallibility (considered in it self) But to the weakness of the Conueyance, and consequently can be no more,

SSS 3

but

*The efficacy  
of Diuine  
Reuelation.*

*what In-  
fluence The  
Motiues  
haue vpon  
Faith?*

*Our Aduer-  
saries  
Doctrin.*

*removes  
Faith from  
its own  
Object.*

but only à Moral certain Faith, not at all Infallible. And then you se, To lay Faith as low as may be, to remove it from its own Center, and fasten it vpon no man knowes what moral ground; Finally to introduce à new, weak, and vncouth way of believing, is the best seruice Mr Stillingfleet can do for God and Christians. But, *Ad rem.*

*The Doctrin  
refuted.*

*Rational  
Inducements  
to Faith are  
ouer presup-  
posed to  
Beliefe.*

*Church  
Motiues  
Slighted.*

9. I Say first. Protestants haue no grounds distinct from the Diuine Testimony, whereby to discouer any one particular Truth, which God has reuealed. I proue the Assertion. These supposed Grounds, are either reduced to the rational Euidence of Christian Religion, already refuted (as laid forth by Mr Stillingfleet) Or to the Doctrin contained in Scripture, And this saith He. Page 170. *VVe belieue by Faith vpon à Diuine Testimony*, which therefore is not the antecedent Reason or ground, Why we belieue it, For no verity Assented to by Faith, can (as assented to) be the preuius Reason of our Assent, or à rational ground iuducing to belieue. Therefore we said, our Sauours Miracles *belieued by Faith*, when we read Scripture, are not the Inducements to belieue them, because an Inducement to Faith, is euer presupposed, and not inuolued in the Act of believing. But it is needles to Say more of this, For no man in his wits, if Questioned by either Iew or Gentil, why he belieues the Sacred Trinity, can for the last Answer tell him, He *belieues so because he belieues. it*, or because he read's that Mystery in à book called Scripture. Now besides these proofles Inducements, there are no other imaginable, whereby the Diuine Testimony can be Discouered, conueyd, or applyed to Belieuers, but only those known Catholick Motiues (as Miracles, Sanctity, Conuerfions of Nations &c) which illustrate the Vniuersal Roman Church, And these Mr Stillingfleet scornfully call's, *mute things, à grand Salad too often serued vp*, found very dry and insipid. Therefore he has no rational Inducement morally Certain for any one Article of Christian Religion, much less for the Tenets of Protestants.

10. I Say. 2. If the Grounds or Motiues inducing to belieue (let these be what this Aduersary pleases) haue Infallible

The connexion with the Diuine Testimony, or conuince vpon Metaphysical Certitude that God speak's the Truths we believe, The Assent giuen to the Motiues is not moral, but highly infallible. Contrarywise, if all Motiues preuius to believe be supposed so fallible, that they may deceiue, Faith neither is, nor can be built vpon them, Therefore Mr Stillingfleet Err's in Saying. *The nearest and most proper Resolution of Faith is into the Grounds, inducing to believe, that such a Testimony is Diuine.*

*Faith cannot be built on Fallible Motiues.*

11. To proue the Assertion, I demand, Whether God obliges all to believe his reuealed verities, vpon his vnerring Testimony, as the only *Formal Object*, or to believe for Motiues extrinsecal to that Testimony, which though morally certain, may possibly Deceiue? Grant the first, Faith stand's fast vpon its own foundation, the Diuine Testimony. Say. 2. It is jointly built on Motiues, as the nearest and most proper Object which in rigour may deceiue, it hangs, as it were, Vpon two *Heterogeneous Principles*, The One most firm and *Infallible*, The Other weak and *fallible*; Viz. Motiues which being fallible, cannot but contribute as much Weakness to Belief, as the infallible Testimony giues it Certainty, And so these two Principles, by their different Influence, Doe and Vndoe, build and destroy, wind on and wind off: The one imparts infallible Certainty, the other staikes it away, and makes Faith no more, but a fluctuating, moral, and fallible Assent.

*The Assertion prom'd.*

12. To aduance this Proof yet further, I Ask Again (if all Diuine Reuelation were by a supposed Impossibility not infallible, but only morally certain,) whether then Christians could believe the reuealed Mysteries, with a Faith as certain, as they now elicit vpon Reuelation? Answer, *Yes*. That Perfection of infallibility, essential to Gods Reuelation, would then be vfeles and impertinent to Support Faith. Answer, *No*, or Say Faith, if the *Hypothesis* stand's, would not be *Disputed* and certain. I infer. Ergo, it is neither Diuine nor certain *De facto*. My reason is. So far, and not further, Gods infallible

*The Proof further explained, convinceth.*

infallible Testimony or the Diuine Reuelation has influence vpon Faith, as fallible motiues Apply it to Belieuers, or give it leaue (might one speak so) to Support that Assent, But these fallible Motiues, which immediatly apply the Reuelation to Belieuers, permit it not to raise that Act to any greater certitude, than only moral which may be false, Therefore the Reuelation *de facto* communicates no more Certainty to Beliefe, than if it were only morally, and not infallibly certain. For here is our Aduersaries Principle. According to the Proofs and grounds, whereby we discouer the Diuine Testimony to be in Being, We belieue, But all these Proofs and grounds Say only *Morally* and *Fallibly*, that the Testimony is now in Being. Therefore faith also can be no more but only Moral, Fallible, and liable to Errour.

*10 Consequences deduced out of*

*Scriptures Doctrin.*

*They make Faith a Conditional Assent.*

13. Hence it followes first, That neither the very Apostles, nor any other Belieuers euer since that time, had any surer faith than only moral, which may be false. It followes. 2. That the Truth of all Christian Religion, inuolues in it a Possibility of falshood, For being applyed or proposed to vs, vpon grounds only fallible and moral, we are to iudge of it, according to the *Exigency* and *Merit* of such weak grounds, And therefore can esteem it no better than fallible. It followes. 3. (And this I would haue noted) That Faith in these mens Principles tend's not absolutely into the Diuine Reuelation, but only with doubt and fear, or meerly *conditionally*. For euery man may rationally Say. Lord if you haue reuealed this truth. *Christ is the true Messias*. I belieue it as vndoubtedly true, but the certainty I haue thereof, is only Setled vpon Motiues which may deceiue me, Therefore my faith can be no more but Hypothetical or conditional, to this Sense. *If you haue reuealed it, I believe, if not I reject it.* Hence you se, it were much better (could not the difficulty be otherwise solued) to Say the Motiues preuius to Faith conuince with Metaphysical certainty, that God speak's by his Scripture and Church, Than to make the Reuelation so strengthles that it can (because weakened by

*fallible*

(false Motives) contribute no other certainty to Belief, but what is Moral, and may be false.

And thus much Mr Stillingfleet, could he proceed consistently (as he doth not) should Assert. For, if (as he saith) considering the Nature of things, moral Certainty be as great, as ~~any~~ as firm an Assent as any Mathematical, or physical certainty, what is it that fright's the man from allowing Infal-  
 lible certainty to Faith? Or what gain's he to Substitute in Lieu of that, another certainty which he call's Moral? For if these two certainties be equally as strong, it is Senseless to establish the One, and reject the Other, but the truth is, in matters of belief, moral certitude has no place, as is largely proved above.

*This Adversary Proceed's not Consequently.*

16. Against this Discourse one may first Obiect. God can oblige all either to believe what is revealed, as infallible *truth* to us, so that there can be no possible Deception in our Belief. Or 2. He may oblige vs to believe His revealed Verities merely according to the efficacy of such Proofs, as intimate to vs that God Speaks; And why may not Mr Stillingfleet build his Faith upon such Grounds or motives as the nearest foundation, though the ultimate Principle of believing be the Divine Revelation? I have partly Answered. Either these Motives convince withall Moral certitude, that the Revelation doth actually Exist, and than the Difficulty ceaseth, for the Assent yielded to them, is infallible; Or contrarywise, They are as Mr Stillingfleet supposes, fallible, And may stand with all their Lustre, though the Revelation really were not in Being. Speak So, it is most clear, such Motives cannot support Faith, For all which right reason can draw from them (if not absolutely infallible) is thus much only, That our Christian Verities according to Prudence, are evidently credible. But by virtue of that Judgement we have not as yet to the infallibility of the Divine Testimony, therefore if God obliges all, ~~desists~~ to ground Faith upon his infallible Testimony which cannot deceive, He ~~must~~ *must* oblige vs not to ground it upon fallible Motives, which may deceive, and stand as Mr Stilling-

*An Objection proposed.*

*Of no force if the Motives be infallible.*

*If fallible, they uphold not Faith.*

*The reason hereof.*



Stillingsfleet will haue it, although God had neuer reuealed any Christian Verity. Again. If we are obliged to free Christian Religion from all Possibility of falshood, That is, if God will haue vs to belieue it as absolutely infallible, We cannot without wrong done to his infinite Verity Say, he obliges vs, to false faith vpon Motiues only morally certain, or absolutely infallible, for thus He would oblige vs to belieue that as *his own Truth*, which possibly may not be Truth, but contrarywise, a lie, a falshood, an Error.

*A second Obiection Solued.*

16. 2. Obiect: Now *De facto*, in this present State there is no Difficulty, For all iudge though the Motiues be fallible, yet God has reuealed our Christian verities. Answ. All do not iudge so, But admit some do, They iudge so by their infallible Assent of Faith, terminated vpon the Verities as reuealed, But antecedently to to beliefe, none can iudge they are infallible reuealed truths, whilst Motiues only fallible ground that Iudgment.

*A third proposed by no Solary, more difficult.*

17. A 3. Obiection. Suppose Eternal truth had neuer reuealed the sacred Trinity (the like is of any other Mytery). Suppose also that the whole System of Motiues had then stood in the same vigour and force as now they appear to vs: Would not God and prudence haue obliged vs in that case to believe as firmly the Trinity, as we now belieue it? I answer. If the Supposition implies no Contradiction, as I verily think it doth, (at least many hold so) Prudence would then haue laid vpon vs an Obligation of firmly belieuing; But what followes from hence? Thus much only, That poor Mortals not seeing the depth of things would haue been invincibly deceiued; But Deception is remote from God, for his wisdom penetrates all Truth, and his Goodnes could not vpon the Supposition haue obliged any to believe a falshood, or that to be, which really is not. Therefore he could not in the Case now supposed, haue afforded Diuine Assistance to make Faith supernatural, because the Obiect by error apprehended belieuable, really was not. Thus much is true, and God might haue obliged vs to judge, That

*Solued. The ground of the Solution.*

the Motives would then have made the Mysteries evidently credible (though they were not) yea, and perhaps further to believe *consequently*; As is said above.

A. 4.<sup>th</sup> Objection. This Proposition is true. We believe the *Motives*, Or, we prove that God Speaks because the Motives apply and convey the Divine Testimony to vs. I distinguish the Proposition. We believe for the *Motives as Inducements*, to settle Faith vpon another Object. Viz. *God's Testimony*, I grant it. We believe for the *Motives*, That is, We ground our faith vpon them, as either the nearest or more remote Object, *Why We believe*, I Deny it. Thus, the will loues good, because the vnderstanding apprehend's or conueyes good to it, yet loues not the knowledge which conueyes it. Fire laid neer to fewel burn's, the approximation burn's not, but is only *Conditio applicans*, a necessary condition applying heat which burn's. So we say the Motives enable to make it most *credible* that God speak's, But no more ground Faith, than approximation burn's, or the knowledge, when we prosecute Good, is the Object of loue.

*A fourth Objection solved*

*by a clear Instance.*

13. And here by the way you se Mr Stillingfleets constant Incur, who makes the Motives inducing to Faith the foundation of it. This is, in other Terms: He Confound's the Iudgement when we Assert, the *reuealed Mysteries* are evidently Credible, with the Assent of *Faith it self*; And will needs haue the formal Object wherevpon Faith is built, not only to be the Divine Reue- lation but the Motives also, though they can do no more but *lead the Will* guided by reason, to settle belief vpon the infallibility of the first Reuealer.

*Mr Stilling: Constant Error, discovered*

## CHAP. V.

*More quarrels Answered, Mr Stillingfleets endeavour  
to catch Catholicks in a Circle, demonstrated  
both vain and improbable. His Objec-  
tions are forceless. A word to an  
unlearned Canil.*

*His meaning  
obscure.*

*The Church  
revelled, no  
Majesty in  
Scripture  
can gain  
Beliefe.*

I. **F** Rom the Page last cited, to P. 123. I find nothing in Mr Stillingfleet worth any larger Answer than is given already. Here He tells vs, *That many things in Christian Religion are to be believed before we can Imagin any such thing, as an infallible Testimony of our Church.* It is hard to guess at his meaning, for he names not one Article, thus Assented to. Perhaps he would Say, That the Verities reuealed in some books of Scripture, called *Protocanonical* known by their own proper Signatures or Motiues, as the *Harmony, Sanctity, and Majesty* of the Style, may be believed without the Testimony of an Infallible Church. If so, I Answer first. All this Harmony or Majesty, considered only as Objects of Sense, or as preuiously known by their *Natural Euidences* (thus far and not further they bear the name of Motiues) auail not to belieue any Verity in Scripture, if the *infallibility of the Church be reiected*. And therefore we said aboue, this Sanctity and Harmony are assented to by Faith only, after the Church immediately Euidenced by Her Motiues, Ascertain's vs. that such Books are Diuine. I Answer. 2. Grant such Motiues may in some weak manner, and particular Circumstances conduce to belieue the Scriptures Diuinity, yet in this present State, when we haue a Church most clearly manifested, which both Ascertain's vs of Scripture and the Sense also, it would be no less than an vndiscreet rashness.

not to cast off her Authority, ( being the most facile and plainest ) and in Lieu of Her, to rely on another forrain, vnfit way of Believing by Motiues, not half so clear, and far less conuin-

2. Thus some Diuines Teach, though à Heathen after à dure Consideration of the works in Nature, may come to belieue that God will reward Good, and punish Euil, yet none do Affect, That when our Christian Articles are clearly proposed to him, by the Pastors and Teachers of the Church, For example, That *Christ dyed for vs. The dead shall rise again. God will reward the iust &c.* That then if he reiect Church Authority, he can belieue the forenamed Articles with Diuine Faith. This I Deny, And the reason is, because that way of belieuing, when à more ordinary and facile is proposed, Seem's temerarious and impudent. And so it would be, should any now when the Church giues vs full Assurance of the Scriptures Diuinity lay aside Her Authority, and Say. I will absolutely belieue this or that Truth to be God's word, because I Discouer apparent Signs. of Diuinity, in what I read.

An Influence

It is imprudent to reiect what easiest was of Believing.

3. In the next place, Mr Stillingfleet Quarrel's with à word. In Roman Catholick Church, which, in his opinion, is iust as much to say. The German vniuersal Emperour, That is particular and vniversal together, for Roman restrain's or marks out one Church, vniversal includes all. Answ. It is à meer Quibble exploded by the Fathers, particularly S. Hierome. *Apolog. 1. aduersus Ruffin.* so far from the beginning, who call's the Roman Faith the Catholick Faith. *VVbat, Saith he, is Ruffinus his Faith?* It is that wherewith the Roman Church preuail's, or another founded in Origens Writings? *Si Romanam responderit, Ergo Catholici sumus.* If he Answer's it is the Roman Faith, This Inference is good, we both profess the vniuersal Faith. Therefore Roman and Vniuersal are here synomimal or words of one Signification, which the Apostle clearly Insinuates. *Rom. 1. 8. Your Faith is renowned in the whole World ouer.* Again. *Epist. 16. ad Principiam Virg: circa medium.* He shoves that the most ancient Saints addressed them-

A meer quibble exploded by Fathers,

S. Hierom's  
express  
Testimonies.

selues to to the Roman Church, *Quasi ad ratissimum communium san-  
portum*, as to a place of refuge, or of mutual Communion,  
which was General, Publick, and belonged to all. Yet more. When  
Epist: 57. *ad Damasum*, This great Doctor positiuely teaches, That  
he was ioyned in Communion, with no other Society of men then  
such as adhered to *Damasus*, S. Peters Successor, (*Where vpon the  
Church was built*) And that those who ate the lambe out of this House,  
were prophane. Did he think ye speak of any one particular Roman  
Diocels, and not of the vniuersal Catholick Church? It is con-  
trary to his Discourse, and reason also.

Other Fa-  
thers Speak  
with S.  
Hierome.

4. Se more of this subiect in the Epistle of S. Athanasius to  
two Popes, *Inissus* and *Marcus*, Read also S. Cyprians Epistle. 52. n. 1.  
And S. Ambrose, *De obitu fratris*, about the middle, and know  
withall, The word *Roman* added to *Catholick* is not to limit the vni-  
uersal Iurisdiction of that See, But to distinguish Orthodox Be-  
lieuers from Hereticks, who were professed Enemies of the Ro-  
man Faith. If therefore we may rightly comprise vnder this word  
*Roman* all other Christian Societies, past or present vniited in  
belief with this one Mother Church, There is neither *Hell* nor  
*Solacism* in speech to call the Roman (euer One and the same in  
Faith) the vniuersal Church of Christ.

why the Ro-  
man Church  
was called  
Vniuersal.

Mr Spilling  
endeavour  
more then  
weak,

to catch  
Catholicks  
in a Circle.

5. Page. 127. To catch Catholicks in a Circle Mr Stilling-  
fleet Ask's, why we belieue Scriptures to be the Word of God.  
If we Affirm vpon this Ground; That the Church which is in-  
fallible deliueurs them so to vs, He demand's again (and bidd's us  
Answer if we can) whether 't is possible to beliete the Churches  
infallibility any other way, than because infallible Scriptures Say,  
She is infallible, which implies a plain Circle. Answer. It is very  
possible, For seing Scripture demonstrat's not *ex terminis* its own  
Diuinity, nor can be made euidently credible by any light inter-  
nal to the Book, some other infallible Oracle distinct from it,  
must necessarily ascertain vs, that the Book is Diuine, And the  
Doctrin there preserued, is yet pure as the Apostles wrote it.  
But this Oracle can be no other but the Church which proues  
Her selfe by Signs and Miracles to speak in Gods name, *independ-  
antly*

of Scripture, therefore the first act of Faith, whereby we believe in a General way the Churches infallibility, relies not (as this Gentleman weakly supposes) on Scripture, But vpon the Church it self, as the most known manifested Oracle. And thus the Circle is easily auoyded.

6. You will see more clearly what I aime at, by one Instance taken from the Primitiue Christians. Ask what induced them to believe the Apostles Infallibility when they Preached? All answer, They believed so, because those blessed men immediately proued themselves commissioned Oracles sent from God, and made their Doctrin evidently Credible by sensible Signs and Wonders which surpassed the force of Nature. Very true: In like manner we believe the Churches infallibility, hauing serious Motiues as Stronge to believe that Truth vpon her Authority, as euer Christians had to believe that S. Paul was infallible when he preached. If then there was no Vicious Circle in those first Christians Faith, there can be none in Ours, with all of vs have infallible Oracles, manifested by Supernatural Signs to rely on: And Those first now mentioned had them before Scripture was written. You will say this Discourse seem's to proue, we cannot believe the Churches Infallibility vpon the Scriptures Testimony. It has been Answered ouer and ouer, supposing Scripture be one admitted as God's sacred Word, we proue the Churches infallibility so strongly by it against all Adversaries, who own the Book as Diuine, that none of them shall euer returne a probable answer to our alleged Testimony.

*No Circle in the Primitiue Christians Faith.*

*Therefore none in our Resolution,*

7. But what Saith Mr. Stillingfleet. Is there no difference between the way of prouing a thing to an Adversary, and resolving our own Faith? Answer yes. But we both resolve and proue. We Resolve the first Act of Faith concerning Scripture and the Churches infallible Authority, and believe that Book to be of Diuine Inspiration, because this Oracle saith so. Then we Argue vpon a Principle proued by vs, and supposed, (though not proued) by Sectaries. The Principle is, Scrip-

*How we both resolve and proue the Churches infallibility.*

ture



ture is God's Word. We read the book which all Christians Say is Divine, And proue also from it the Churches infallibility against our Aduersaries *Ex probatis & concessis*, That the book is Divine. Here is no danger of a Circle, nor any fault in this way of Arguing.

*Another Reply  
inserted.*

8. Yet Mr Stillingfleet makes his Exceptions, and will needs haue the Circle goe on against vs. You proue, Saith he, the Churches infallibility from such Passages. *Super hoc Petram. Posce omnes &c.* But how come you to know infallibly, that the Sense of those places is as you belieue, For your Aduersaries deny any such thing as infallibility proued out of them? I may Answer first, by proposing the like Question. How do these Aduersaries know that their contrary sense is exactly the true Meaning of the Holy Ghost? Will they tell vs they think so (here is all we haue from them) what am I better for that? When the Donatists, Pelagians, and all Heretiques can think as boldly as any Protestant, And by their deluded thoughts vsense, as we see by experience, the most choise and sacred Passages in holy writ. To whom then shall we recurre in case the Sense be doubtful? I Answer to the Church. O, saith Mr Stillingfleet Here we are got into a Circle again, and though his own words (see them in the page cited) give no force to his Probation, yet I'll help them on to all the Strength his meaning is capable of. He should therefore Argue thus. We belieue the Churches infallibility because the true sense of Scripture sayes, *she is infallible*. Again, We belieue this very Sense of Scripture to be infallibly true, because the infallible Church saith so. I haue Answered. The first Act of Faith wherwith we belieue the Churches infallibility, is not at all founded vpon the true Sense of Scripture, as yet not known (*in illo signis*) to be so much as Divine, but vpon the Churches own infallible Testimony made by it self, and for it self, immediately credible.

*Another Reply.  
Answered.*

9. Now if we Speak of another Distinct, consequent, and more explicate act of Faith, when we belieue the Churches in-

-falli-

fallibility vpon this ground, That she declares the Scriptures genuine Sense which proues Her an infallible Oracle, There is no difficulty at all, Because this very Exposition or Interpretation of Scripture brought to its last Principle, is vltimately resolved into (and therefore again belieued vpon) the same infallible Authority of the Church, or rather vpon Scripture and the Churches Interpretation together, For thus jointly taken, They ground Faith, and not like two disparate Principles, As if we first belieued the Scriptures Sense independently of the Churches Interpretation, And then again belieued the Churches Interpretation to be infallible, because the Sense of Scripture known aliunde, or without Depending on Church Authority, Saith she is infallible. This cannot be, if Scripture and the Churches Interpretation indiuisibly concur to this latter act of Faith, whereof we now speak.

*The sense of  
Scripture  
resolved, and  
belieued.*

*Vpon Scrip-  
ture and  
Church Au-  
thority  
jointly.*

10. Here then is à Dilemma that clear's all, and free's vs from the least Shadow of à Circle. We either know (or be- lieue) the Scriptures Sense independently of the Churches infallible Interpretation, or receiue it vpon her infallible Authority. Grant the first, There is no danger of à Circle, for in case that Truth were known vpon à sure Principle distinct from the Church, it would be another new and as strong à Probation of her Infallibility, as if an Angel sent from Heauen should interpret Scripture to the Catholick Sense, And then we might Assent to the Churches Infallibility vpon two disparate Principles (which proue not one another). The one Ordinary, the Churches own Interpretation, The other independent and extraordinary, Should an Angel or Prophet sent from God, interpret. Say. 2. We beleeue the Sense of Scripture vpon the Churches own infallible Authority, There are no two imaginable Propositions to make à Circle of, whilst that Sense internal to the letter, can not be infallibly propounded otherwise, then by the Church.

*The Affec-  
tion Cleared.*

*This way, no  
two Proposi-  
tions to make  
à Circle  
of.*

11. Page. 128. I find an vnlearned Obiection much to this Sense. We Catholicks destroy all Possibility of auoiding à Circle, if we proue by the Motiues of credibilty no new Reue-

*A weak Ob-  
jection in  
effect solved.*

*Repeated  
Again,*

*One Instan-  
ce clear's all.*

lations Distinct from the old; And this we Pretend not to, For we only seek to euince by these Motiues à Diuine Assistance with the Church in euery thing She Defines, but this Assistance cannot be proued from any other ground, but only from the Promises made in Scripture, Therefore we are still in à Circle, For we believe the Scriptures infallible, because of the Churches Testimony, and we believe the Church infallible, because of the Promises in Scripture concerning the Assistance of the Holy Ghost with the Church, so as to secure Her from all Error. Here in Effect is the same Obiection repeated again, Therefore I Answer. We believe not in the first place the Churches infallible Assistance moued therevnto by the Promises in Scripture, For this *General Act of Faith* wholly relies vpon the Churches own infallible Testimony without depending on Scripture; because Her Testimony is made most Credible to reason by conuincing Motiues, before we believe, that She is *infallibly Assisted*. All must Say what I now Assert, For before Scripture was written, The Primitive Christians believed infallible Assistance granted the Apostles in euery Doctrin they taught, being induced to believe so by the Signes and Miracles which those blessed men Euidenced. In like manner we in this present State, answerable to the Procedure of these Christians, hauing the same Motiues manifest in the Church, may well be induced to believe, That She both now is, and euer was no lesse Assisted by the Holy Ghost to speak Truth, then the Apostles were, for as much as concern's the Substance and Verity of her Doctrin.

CHAP. VI.

Mr Stillingfleet solves not His Adversaries Argument:  
A word of his tedious Shuffling. The Motives  
of Credibility both distinguish the Church from all  
other Heterodox Communities, and prove Her Infallible.  
The Agreement with the Primary Doctrin,  
no Mark of the Church. More Mistakes and Errors  
discovered. Of Mr Stillingfleets double Faith  
who Believes, but not upon Divine the Testimony,  
That the Books of Scripture contain Gods word in  
them: Yet Believes the Doctrin in those books, to  
be Divine.

1. **I**N the next place, Mr Stillingfleet labours to solve his  
Adversaries main Argument, the Substance whereof  
is. As Christ and his Apostles proved themselves Oracles sent from God  
by their Works, Signs, and Miracles; Again as the Primitive Christians  
induced by such Signs believed Christ and the Apostles upon their  
own Testimony to be infallible Teachers: So we, having euer had the  
like Works, Signs, and Miracles manifest in the Church, are prudently  
induced to believe Her as an Infallible Oracle, upon her own infallible  
Testimony.

The substance  
of the Argument.

2. To solve this plain and pressing Argument, one of these  
two things must be done: Either a Disparity is to be given  
between Those first Signs and Miracles of the Apostles, and  
the latter of the Church, or it must be shown wherein the Inference  
made, is Defectiue or vnconcluding. Viz. That the Church

What's required so  
to solve the Difficulty.

evidenced by Her Signes, is not proved God's infallible Oracle, as the Apostles were proved by their Signes, to be infallible Teachers. I heartily wish, any would read Mr Stillingfleet through all his long Pages of this Subject, And afterwards Gratify me so far as to Say, where or in what Paragraph the direct Answer lies to either of these Difficulties, I would Own it as à Singular favour, in the Interim give me leaue to Speak truth. He Shuffles all along, Waues the main Matter, and Answers nothing.

*Nothing is,  
or can be  
answered.*

3. Thus he trifles. The Church of Rome is infinitely obliged to us, could we make all good we Say. Our Attempt is Heroical and generous. What, must men be as much obliged now to believe your Church infallible, as that Moses and Christ were so? He Wonders nothing at the Stupidity in our Censures of all out of our Church, if to deny our Churches infallibility be an Offence of so high à nature. Then he Asks. P. 129. Whether the same Motives of credibility belong to our Church, by which Christ and his Apostles shewed their Testimony to be infallible? We haue Answered Yea, and proved the Assertion largely. Disc. 1. C. 7. 8. 9. And here press him to refute our Probations; Or if he hold's them not refutable, to give à Disparity betwixt the Apostolical, and our Churches Motives.

*More Trifles  
returned.*

4. But he run's on headlong, and to slight the Devotion and Charity manifest in the Church, talk's of our Superstitious Ceremonies, and burning of Heretiques. To what purpose are these Parergons when à Categorical Answer to the main Business is expected? Is it only to give à vulgar Reader Entertainment, or to withdraw all who peruse his Book from minding where, and how he would Shift off the Difficulty? He shall not do it, for we will follow him closely, and therefore take notice of one great folly. P. 130. Where he pleases to Say. How much we have befooled our selves, in attempting to prove the infallibility of our Church, in the same manner as Christ and the Apostles proved their Infallibility. And Mark his Proof expressed in this proofles Proposition. Insisting, Saith he, on that of Miracles as the greatest Evidence of their infallibility (he means the Apostles) our Church cannot with any face pretend to it. Is not this Heroical and generous only to Say we

*More Parer-  
gons in Lieu  
of à Solid  
answer.*

are

we befooled and Faceles, When we haue conuincd in the Chap-  
ter already cited, that the Church has wrought Miracles euery  
way equal with those, which the Apostles wrought? What Doings  
are these? May men vapour thus with their bare Assertions,  
whilst we Proue, and stil expect to haue the Arguments solued,  
either by Reason or Authority?

To say we  
are befooled  
is no Proof.

5. Page. 130. As if one still sought to diuert à Reader with  
à deep piece of Learning. He tells vs Mans vnderstanding becau-  
se finite cannot be in it self infallible, without receiuing à partici-  
pated Infallibility from an infinite Power aboue it, And à tedious  
Discourse followes herevpon known to euery one, but what is  
all this Said, ouer and ouer, to our Difficulty? Haue we yet  
any Disparity giuen between the Apostles Miracles and those which  
the Church Euidences, Or is our Inference already made, any way  
infringed hitherto? Not à word is yet returned to either, and  
therefore the Argument stand's in its vigour without reply.

More Shif-  
ting yet.

6. Page. 131. He saith first. *The Apostles deliuered not their  
Doctrin from Themselues but immediatly from God, and consequently their  
Testimony must be owned infallible.* Answ. Neither can the Church  
without Diuine Assistance deliuer her Doctrin as from Herselfe,  
far from God. As therefore the Apostles were immediatly In-  
spired to teach as they did, so the Church is immediatly Assisted  
by the same Holy Ghost to define as she doth, and vpon this  
account her Testimony must be owned infallible, For what euer  
reason or Authority ascertains the one, ascertains also the other.  
And here we may come to Principles if our Adversaries please  
Let them euince ( and t'is à Truth ) that the Apostles were so  
eminently priuiledged, I will lay down my Proofs by Theirs, and  
shew by as great Authority, that the Church has her Priuiledge  
also of Diuine Assistance.

The Apostles  
Diuinely  
inspired, the  
Church in-  
fallibly  
Assisted.

The Proofs  
are equal

7. He Adds. *It bring most vnreasonable to think that God would  
suaue such persons ( the Apostles ) with so extraordinary à power, who  
should falsify their Message, and deceiue the world.* Gentle Reader  
consider à little. The Apostles taught the world for à few years  
only. The Roman Catholick hath stood inuincible, and taught

A paradox

Millious



326 Disc. 3. C. 6. Mr Stillingfleet solves not

*The Apostles  
taught for à  
Short time,  
and Erred  
not.*

*The Church  
longer, and  
grossly erred.*

*Church Mo-  
tius both  
distinguish  
and prove.*

*A sling at  
Bellarmine  
to no purpose.*

Millions of Christians for sixteen Ages, If then it be vnreasonable, yea impious to think, that God could permit those first Blessed men to falsify their message, and deceiue with error for that short time; Is it not I beseech you as highly vnreasonable and impious to Iudge, that an Infinite Goodnes could permit the very Church he founded, made glorious by Her Miracles and other Signal Motiues (all which Proue her fauoured with à Power extraordinary) to falsifie her Message, to betray Her Trust, and lead Millions of souls into damnable error, during the vast circuit of à thousand yeares? Consider I Say, And blush at his boldnes, who dare impeach this purest Spouse of falshood.

8. Page. 132. He goes on. *These Motiues of credibility were wont to be esteemed only the notes of Distinction of the true Church from all others, and not rational Proofs of her infallibility.* Answ. They both distinguish and proue. The Apostles were distinguished from all false Teachers, and proued also Oracles sent from God by their Signs and Miracles, The like we say of the Church, whose Marks and Miracles are not inferior to those the Apostles manifested, and far more Numerous. Shew vs à disparity if you can, or be silent hereafter.

9. Page. 132. I find nothing but first leaue giuen Bellarmine, to multiply his fifteen Notes of the Church to fifteen hundred. How comes this to the Purpose? Or what need is there of multiplying, when One of those Fifteen, (and Ile tell you which it is) *the Churches glorious Miracles*, hath so silenced Sectaries, that none of them all has hitherto attempted to return any better answer than this. *Bellarmino thou liest?* He Saies. 2. *The only certain Note of the true Church is its agreement With the Primary foundation of it, in the Doctrin which was infallible, and attested by miracles vndoubtedly Diuine.* This is à strange Note or Mark, which cannot be distinguished from the thing Marked, as the Motiues of Credibility, *manifestly sensible*, are distinguished from the Doctrin believed.

10. Answer therefore, Good Sr, is this Agreement with the Primitiue Doctrin its owns *Self Euidence*, as à Mark should be?

That's made  
à clear  
Mark

which Sec-  
taries must  
say, is yet  
disputable  
and obscure.

Conditional  
Propositions,  
here Proofs

A fallible  
Church  
cannot be  
Consonant  
to Christ's  
Doctrin.

10

Or do all dissenting Parties accord thus far, That anciently such was the Primitiue Doctrin, but now is changed from it selfe into another new Learning? Most evidently no. For the whole contest between the Church and Her Aduersaries ( may these be heard) is, whether of vs Professe the Primitiue Doctrin laid in the first foundation of Christianity? This point then being yet disputable (for so Sectaries will haue it) it is meer folly to make it a Mark whereby to distinguish truth from falshood, And there is no clearing it from Improbability vnless you say. Sectaries more than the rest of the world can exactly tell vs, who those Christians are that now agree with the Primitiue Doctrin, and who dissent from it; But others as wise as they, want faith to belieue such bare Assertions without Proofs and Principles. In a word there is no knowing what the Primitiue Doctrin was, nor can any now haue infallible certainty of the Apostles Miracles, without a Church actually in Being, and Infallible.

11. He saith. 3. If our Doctrin be repugnant to what was Originally deliuered by the Founder of the Christian Church; our Society is not the Christian Church: Answ. No more. Sr, is Tours, if it be repugnant. But To what purpose are these Ifs, and conditional Propositions? when Proofs are expected from Accusers. Proue you if you can, but doe it vpon sound Principles, that our Doctrin is repugnant to that which was Originally deliuered, you are Conquerour, and we no more Catholicks, but, Sr, à hundred more of your Volumes will neuer Euince this.

12. He demands. 4. whether we cannot conceiue à Church should be Consonant to the Doctrin of Christ, without being infallible? Answ. No truly: Tis impossible and here is the Reason, because in à little space then one Age, there would be as many Religions in such à Church, as there are Townes or villages in it, And perhaps more. And is not this manifest in England, where almost every year we haue à new Religion coyned? Therefore to imagin à Society of men vnited together in the belief of Christ's infallible Doctrin, without an infallible Oracle to teach, is à meer Chimera. O, but euery Man in this fallible Society is bound

to take care of his soul, and to believe the infallible Doctrine of Christ. I Answer. If to take care of his Soul necessarily implies the Belief of Christ's infallible Doctrine, it is impossible to take that care, because he can have no infallible Assurance of Christs Doctrine, without a Church which teaches it infallibly. Hereof enough is said above.

*A Parallel  
of Miracles.*

13. Page. 134. He desires to have such Miracles wrought as may convince Infidels, as to the point of the Churches infallibility. Answ. He has all he can desire. *The Blind see, The Dumb speak, the Deaf hear, The Dead rise up to life again* were our Sauours own Miracles, and convinced Infidels, but these are our Churches likewise, as is largely proved. *Disc. 2. C. 8.* What would the man have more?

*An Evident  
Miracle  
Sighted.*

14. Page. 135. To his no little disgrace, without any Proof at all, he scornfully slights that evident and most known Miracle wrought at *Zaragoza* in Spain. But enough of this above. *Disc. 2. C. 9.* Here I can add, having it from a right Honourable Person yet living, who heard His Majesty Charles the first Say, in the presence of many others. The cure of that young Man at *Zaragoza* was certain. Some hereupon Proposing a further Question, whether it could be thought a Miracle His Majesty Answered be it as you will, the thing was done, The leg cut off and buried, was certainly restored again.

*The Connexion  
between  
Miracles  
and Infalli-  
bility unin-  
ced.*

15. In the same Page he Questions whether the Motives we produce belong only to our Church? But grant, Saith he, they do belong, its hard to find the connexion between them and Infallibility. We have Answered to the first. No Society of men can shew the like Motives, and therefore urge Mr Stillingfleet to produce his Evidences, That is, To prove they belong to any other Society, But to the Roman Catholick Church only. The other point concerning the Connexion, Nicodemus a Prince of the Jewes. *Iohn. 3. V. 2.* long since cleared. *Rabbi we know thou art come a Master or Teacher from God, for no man can do these Signs which thou do'st, unless God be with him.* Was

Disc. 3. C. 6. *His Aduersaries Argument.* 519

Was then our Saviour proued by the works and the Miracles he did, a *Master sent from God* to teach? And did these Signs conuince reason, that God was with him when he taught? None can deny it. Therefore none can doubt, but that He was also proued infallible by Virtue of His wonders, And consequently the connexion between them and infallibility hold's good. But this Church (and here is our Inference) Euidences the very like Signs about the force of nature, therefore reason concludes that She also is proued Infallible. Wherefore, Mr Stillingfleet is either obliged to find a flaw in the consequence, or to giue a Disparity between our Church-Motiuies, and those of other Primitiue, which he neuer goes about to do.

*True In-  
ference.*

16. I meet with nothing in *His* 136. Page, but loud vntruths concerning our Doctrin of Pennance, as if we indulged sin here, and yet gaue men hope of Heauen hereafter. It is a Calumny (euery one knowes we teach no such Doctrin) and in this place a meer Parergon besides. I therefore slight it, and take notice of another straying out of the way. P. 137. where he Speak's thus. *The Principles of any Conclusion, must be of more credit then the Conclusion it self. Therefore if the Articles of Faith, The Trinity and Resurrection be the Conclusions, And the Principles by which they are proued be only Ecclesiastical Tradition, it must needs follow, That the Tradition of the Church is more infallible then the Articles of faith, if the Faith we haue of those Articles should be finally resolved into the veracity of the Churches Testimony.*

*Another Pa-  
rergon to dis-  
uise the  
Reader.*

17. This Difficulty not well digested, either Proues nothing, or makes euery Resolution of faith void, For suppose I be- lieue the Trinity because God hath reuealed the Mystery plainly in Holy Scripture. I Ask whether God's Testimony, supposed the Principle of belieuing, be more infallible then the Trini- ty, which is belieued vpon it, here called the Conclusion? I say, The Diuine Testimony is more Infallible, I'll Affirm the very same of the Churches Proposition, For what the Church speak's, God speak's. Answer No. And giue this

*Euery Reso-  
lution made  
null by this  
Objection.*

X x x

reason,

*How the  
Churches  
Testimony is  
the Clearer  
Principle.*

reason, Because we believe the Testimony and the Mystery attested, by one *Indivisible* certain Act of Faith, which tends infallibly upon both these Objects at once, without making Conclusions, The difficulty ceases. And hereby you see first. How the Churches Testimony is a Principle to the thing believed, For every one knows, that a Formal Object compared with its Material which lies in darkness, is the *greater Light*, and has the preheminance to be immediately known *For it Self*, and not for another: Whereas, the material Object would still remain in a State of obscurity, and never be yielded to, but by the Energy of its formal Motive. In this sense therefore, the *ultima ratio assentiendi*, or formal Object may be well called the more certain Principle, Though as I now said, the Assent be *indivisibly terminated* upon both Objects infallibly.

*The Mistake  
discovered.*

18. You see. 2. Where the mistake of our Adversarie lies. He Supposes faith generated by Discourse. First that we believe the Trinity (for example) upon one Principle. Viz. The Churches Tradition or Testimony, and then descend lower to believe the same Mystery upon God's Revelation distinct from the Churches Testimony, As if, forsooth, the Churches Testimony were an *extrinsecal condition* preparing all to believe upon the Divine Revelation (This must be intended or nothing is said to the Purpose) now we utterly deny the Supposition, and Say when we believe the Trinity, or any other particular Mystery upon the Churches Testimony, or rather upon this revealed truth: *God speaks so by the Church*, We then elicit not two distinct Acts one depending on the other, but with one *indivisible tendency of Faith* believe at once, *the Formal and Material Object together*, That is, we believe God speaks the truth by the Church, which is to say: we Assent to it because he speaks it, *by his own infallible Oracle*.

*One Indivisible tendency in Faith,*

19. This one syllogism clears all. *What the Church Says is true. The Church Says God has revealed the Trinity. Ergo that is true.* We resolve the *Major*, or first Proposition thus. *What the Church says is true.* That is. What God speaking by the Church.

Disc. 3. C. 6. His Adversaries Argument. 531

Church faith, is true. But God speaking by the Church Saies the Mystery of the Trinity is, *ergo*, That's true. Where you see we only Discourse (could Faith be so generated which some Divines Assert) from the Formal obiect, or from Gods Revelation, to the Material believed. Now Mr Stillingfleet makes his Sense of the Maior Proposition, (and here lies his Errour) *That the Church Saies of Her self, not including Gods Revelation, is an act of Faith and true*, But the Church of her own sole Authority saith, God revealed the Trinity. Ergo I must first believe the Mystery by one act of Faith vpon the Churches Testimony, as à Preparatiue to believe it better, vpon Gods pure Revelation, which is another distinct Formal Obiect from the Churches Testimony. This Discourse is implicatory. First because the Churches Testimony, if separated from the Diuine Revelation, can ground no act of Faith. 2. If which is true; it only cooperates with, or consummates the ancient Revelation in order to the Belief of any Mystery, it can help nothing to bring in à Conclusion, wholly as obscure as it self is. That word, *Conueyance*, beguiled Mr Stillingfleet, for he thought, if the Churches Testimony conueyes vnto vs the ancient Revelation, it must be excluded from being infallible, and much more from being à ioynt Motiue with it. Herein lies his Errour.

The Errour more Clearly pointed at.

What beguiled thy Adversary.

10. It is difficult enough, To Say what He would be at in his two next pages. Some times he will haue no want of Euidence in faith, as to the Reason inducing to believe, And if he means, That what we Assent to by faith must be evidently Credible before we believe, its à Truth, but if he will haue the very act of Faith elicited to be evident, the Apostle. Heb. 11. 1. contradicts him. For Faith is an Argument of things not appearing. Sometimes again he saith, the Assent is not required to what is obscure and Vnevident, And then to mollify the Proposition, adds. But what is evident to vs And therefore credible. In à word, if he intend's thus much only, That the euidence of credibility precedes the inuident act of Faith, all is well. But by

Faith implies Obscurity.

Obscure Doubt.



*The truth of  
the Trinity  
evident to no  
Believer.*

one Instance we may guess where he errs. The manner of the Hypostatical union, saith he, *is to vs inevident*, whereunto God requires not our Assent, but to the truth of the thing it selfe. Answer, good Sr, Is the truth of the Hypostatical union in it selfe, or of the Trinity evident to vs? Where lies that Evidence? Or vpon what Principle is it grounded? Hereticks are found that for the very difficulty of these inevident Mysteries deny both, And the best Orthodox Christians ingenuously Profess, they so far Surpass all natural capacities, That ther is no assenting to either but only by an humble submissiue Faith, which essentially implies Obscurity. If therefore what you say be true. We may lawfully suspend our Assent, where God giues not evidence of the thing Assented to, you may Consequently suspend your Assent, and neither believe the Trinity, nor the Incarnation.

*An Objection  
Proposed.*

21. Page. 140. He demands why we believe the Resurrection of the dead? We Answer because God reueals it. But Questioned again why we believe, that God hath reuealed it? We Answer because the infallible Church saies God did speak it, whereby it is plain that though our first Reply be from God's Authority, yet the last Resolution of our faith is made into the infallibility of the Churches Testimony: For though God had reuealed it, yet if this Reuelation were not attested by the Church's infallible Testimony, We should not haue sufficient ground to believe it, Therefore the Churches infallibility must be more credible, then the Resurrection of the dead.

*Answered by  
Scripture it  
selfe.*

22. To giue a Satisfactory Answer, please to hear what I demand also. Mr Stillingfleet believes that our Sauour is the true Messias, because Christ spake the Truth with his own sacred mouth. *Iohn. 4. 26.* And if he believes Scripture, He Assents again to that truth vpon S. Iohns Testimony, And so firmly believes it, that if the Euangelist (or some other of like authority) had not wrote it, he could not haue believed S. Iohns Testimony, or that our Sauour Spake those words. Here is our solution. God long since said the dead shall rise, but

### Disc. 3. C. 6. His Aduersaries Argument. 533

For this Ancient Reuelation being remote from vs, (if solely considered) cannot moue vs to belieue the truth, vnless an Infal-  
lible Oracle Ascertain vs that God once spake it, iust as S. Iohn assures all that Christ said. *I am the Messias*. Ask now why Mr Stillingfleet belieues, that our Sauour vttered those words? He will Answer, God speaking by S. Iohn an Infal-  
lible Oracle, Affirms it. So I say God speaking by the Church, an Infal-  
lible Oracle, affirm's the Resurrection of the dead. O, but independently of Church Authority we know the resurrection is reuealed in Scripture, Contrariwise we know nothing of our Sauours words, but from S. Iohns Testimo-  
ny. Answ. we know indeed the Resurrection is asserted in a Book called Scripture, But that the Assertion is Diuine, or uttered by Eternal Truth, we haue no more Infal-  
lible certainty without the Churches Testimony, Then if any vulgar Samaritan, without Diuine Assistance, had said. *Christ spake those words. I am the Messias*.

*An Applica-  
tion of the  
Instance  
clear in  
Scripture*

23. By what is now briefly touched your se first, That as our Sauours own words and S. Iohns reflex Testimony vpon them, concur *Indiuisibly* to the Faith of these Aduersaries; So the reuealed Verity of the Resurrection in Scripture, And the Churches reflex Testimony which infallibly Ascertain's vs that it is reuealed, may well *indiuisibly* concur as one compleat Mo-  
tiue to our faith, whereof more hereafter. I say *indiuisibly*; And therefore this Faith vltimately resolu'd, relies not first vpon Scripture only, as our Aduersary conceiues, without any relation to the Church, and then rest's vpon the Churches Testimony, as vpon a distinct Formal Object, but by one simple Tendency it pitches on both together.

*The ancient  
Reuelation  
and the  
Churches  
reflex Testi-  
mony*

*Concurr in-  
diuisibly to  
Faith.*

24. You se. 2. Its hard to Say what Mr Stillingfleet would haue, when he tells vs. This Principle. *The Church is infal-  
lible, must be more credible then the Resurrection of the Dead*. If he mean's, the Churches Testimony is to vs in this present State, the more known and nearest Motiue, wherevpon the Faith of that Article is grounded, we easily Assent. But if he

*We clearly  
distinguish  
what our  
Aduersary  
Confound's,*

*An improper  
Speech.*

think's we must first Assent to Scripture, which asserts the Resurrection and own that as Divine, or the only Motiue of Faith without all Church Authority attesting it to be Divine, He errs not knowing our Doctrin: For we Say, no Scripture can be infallible assented to as Divine independently of the Churches Testimony. Again those words. *More Credible*, are improper, if applied to the Formal Obiect of Faith, For the Formal Obiect terminates Belief, the Credibility whereof goes before, and is grounded on the preuius Motiues inducing to belieue.

*Whether we Square Circles in our Resolution of Faith.  
The other mentioned Points in the Title of the  
Chapter, discussed. Vpon what ground those  
Articles called the fundamentals of Faith  
are believed, in the Opinion of  
Sectaries.*

25. In many following Pages we haue little but that the Churches Infallible Testimony must be called the Formal Obiect of Faith, whereof something is said aboue, And you shall haue more hereafter.

*Scripture  
Proued Di-  
uine Con-  
uinceth the  
Churches  
Infallibility.*

26. P. 149. He thinks we Argue like men squaring Circles, when on the one side we make Scripture obscure, yet on the other, giue it light enough to proue the Churches infallibility, And then he talk's of an *Apocalyptical key* hanging at the Churches girdle, able to vnlock all the Secrets in it. To the first I haue Answered. Thus much Supposed, that Scripture is proued Diuine, we haue so great light from the seuerall Passages thereof, to conuince the Churches Infallibility, that no glosses of Sectaries shall euer obscure them. To the Ieer of the *Clauis Apocalypticus* I Answer. Some one, or other must vnlock those high secrets, when

Disc. 3. C. 6. His Aduersaries Argument. 535

is evident innumerable Heretiques by a wrong key wrest Gods word to most pernicious Senses. The Question is whether you, or the Church must turn the key?

27. Page. 152. After thanks given for our Coleworts so often served by those mute Persons, the good Motiues of credibility; He is Bristle and in earnest resolute, to solve our Argument, Asking before hand: Whether it be not enough to be in a Circle our selves, but must needs bring the Apostles into it also? Reflect I beseech you. We said above, that the Apostles induced by the Signal works and Miracles of our Sauour, Assented to his sacred Doctrin as most infallible. In like manner, The Primitiue Christians induced by the works and Miracles of the Apostles belieued them to be infallible Oracles. Therefore we also in this present State, hauing Motiues and Miracles of the same weight and Euidence in the Roman Catholick Church, Belieue with a firm Assent of Faith that She is Gods Oracle, and her Doctrin most infallible. *The short Answer to all this (saith Mr Stillingfleet) is, That the ground why the Christians did Assent to the Apostles Doctrin as true, was because God gave sufficient Euidence, that their Testimony was infallible in such things; where such infallibility was requisite.* Pray, Consider well, whether this be not a gliding, or rather a plain running away from the Difficulty? We haue vrged all this while the Parity between the Churches Motiues, and those of the Apostles, We haue proued and yet plead, That the Euidence is a like in both. The Churches most manifest Signes are. *The blind se. The lame walk. The dead rise, Diuels are dispossessed &c.* And these termed by you *inauoy Coleworts*, and *mute good Things*, were the Apostles Signs also. Are not you therefore obliged in all law of Disputation, either to proue, and vpon sound Principles indeed, That we falsely appropriate such Motiues and Miracles to the Church, Or, if you cannot disparage so illustrious an Euidence, to shew a fault in this Inference? *The Church is known as well by her Signs, so be an infallible Oracle.*

28. Now mark how we are put off with half an Answer. God by you, gaue sufficient Euidence, that the Apostles Testimony

is not and empty words

The force of our Arguments

Wholly wanted

What all law of Disputing requires,

was

336 Disc. 3. C. 6. Mr Stillingfleet Solues not

*Nothing like  
an Answer  
given.*

*The main  
point pressed  
again.*

*which can-  
not be  
Answered.*

*An Argu-  
ment urged,  
ad homi-  
nem.*

was infallible. None doubt's it. But Say on, what want do you find of the very like Euidence in the Church? Her Miracles are as manifest, Her Conuerfions as Numerous (and more) Her fame as renowned, Her name as Catholick, finally might we vie your scornful language, Her Motiues (no mute Persons) speak aloud, and Her Colewarts are euery whit as good, as those were the Apostles serued vp. To this you Answer not a word, but first tell vs with your Aduersary, that the Apostles confirmed their Doctrin with Signs that followed, by which Signes all their Hearers were bound to acknowledge them for infallible Oracles; And it is very true. But we proue the like Signs accompanied and followed the Church in all Ages, therefore her Hearers are also bound to acknowledge Her an infallible Oracle also. In this place you should haue spoken to the Cause and Shewed, Why, or vpon what Account, those first Signs were so powerful to Proue the Apostles infallible, And these latter of the Church lesse pregnant to proue Her infallible. This, and t'is the main Point, you wisely waue For it is vnanswerable, and most frigidly tell vs P. 153. You must be excused as to what follows. viz. That these same Motiues moued the Primitive Christians and vs in our respective Times, to believe the Church. And why not dear Sr? Giue vs the Disparity, and we haue done, but you cannot. If therefore it be a bold Attempt to deny the Euidence of the Church we plead for, which. S. Austin. Epist. 166. compares with the Sun manifest to all, *vsque ad terminos ad terra*, To the last bounds of the earth, it is impossible to weaken the force of our Inference, when we Say. The Church is proued by her Motiues an infallible Oracle. You next Terme this Expression, The formal Object of faith, a Con- cysm, whereby it appear's how little you are versed in School-Diuinity.

29. It seem's in the Page now cited, your Aduersary vrge's this Argument, *Ad hominem*. If a Church be acknowledged infallible in Fundamentals, The last reason why you believe it infallible, must rest vpon this Principle, That the present Church doth Infallibly witnes's so much by her Tradition. To this you

return

term a most dissatisfactory Answer, in these words. *VWhen you Ask* (Protestants) *Why we belieue such an Article to be fundamental, As* an Instance. *Christ will giue Eternal life to them that belieue him,* we answer not because the Church which is infallible in fundamentals holds it to be so, For that were to Answer *Idem per Idem*; But We agree to that Common Reason which is in Mankind, Whether, if the Doctrine of Christ be true, This can be any other than a fundamental Article of it, it being that without which the whole Design of Christian Religion comes to nothing.

The Satisfactory Answer.

30. Good Reader ioyn here two things together. Mr Stillingfleet believes (and Mark the word) such an Article to be Fundamental, not vpon Scripture or Church Authority, for neither makes the Distinction between fundamentals and not fundamentals; And again, before he has proued by any infallible Authority that such a Distinction in his Sense ought to be made, He brings in the common Reason of mankind to Iudge in a matter, which Catholicks Say is *de Subiecto non supponente*, not capable of Iudicature, Because there are no Things in being as he call's fundamentals, distinguishable from others, of a lower Rank. Moreover (And take notice of this) He belieues such an Article to be true because God reueal's it, and belieues it to be a Fundamental Truth vpon this Motiue, that Common reason hold's it so. Doth not therefore this one act of Faith, rely vpon two heterogeneous Formal Obiects? As Faith; it is built vpon God's Veracity, as Fundamental Faith, it stand's tottering vpon mans fallible reason.

highly dissatisfactory, and why?

Faith stand's not vpon two different Motiues Diuine and humane.

31. What followes is as bad or worse. It is sufficient, Say you, that the Church doth deliner from the Consent of vniuersal Tradition, in infallible Rule of Faith (which to be sure, contain's all things Fundamental in it) though She neuer meddles with the deciding what Points are fundamental, and what not. Pray you, Sr, Answer. Who shall dare to meddle with those fundamentals, were they Supposable in your sense, if the Church doth not? What must your priuate Iudgement or mine, decide here? *Quo iure*? by what law or Authority? whilst Scripture saies nothing, and you will not permit

Wor'se Decision yet.

Y y the



*Their broken  
kind of  
Faith.*

the Church to meddle in the Business, were there any such thing to be meddled with, Therefore you leave all to mens private Opinions, to make what they please fundamental, and exclude from Fundamentals every thing which likes them not. And here is your fumbling way of Believing no man knows what, whilst the Church tells you, that every thing She Proposes, as an Article of faith, is Fundamental. This impregnable Principle we establish in Lieu of your loose Faith, and broken way of Arguing also. Lastly you are out in the main Supposition, that Scripture only is the Rule of faith, But hereof. enough is said in the first Discourse.

*The main  
Point con-  
cerning  
Scripture,  
and its sense,  
examined.*

*A reasona-  
ble Demand.*

32. The next Thing I meet with worth any Notice is. p. 158. Whereunto we also ioyn his. 170. Page. It seem's D. Lawd before Mr Stillingfleet wrote his Account, was vrged to give a satisfactory Reply to the Question. *Why, or upon what ground Protestants believe the Books of Scripture to be the Word of God?* Scripture alone Sayes not which Books are Canonical, much lesse declares their Sense in matters controuerted. Sectaries reject the Churches Infallible Authority And say, She is not to tell vs which Books are Scripture, or, what their sense is, though admitted as God's word. Is it not very reasonable think ye to demand upon what Ground these men stand, when either they believe Scripture to be the word of God, or give an Assent to the particular doctrines contained in the book? For clearing these difficulties, you shall haue Mr Stillingfleets own words P. 170.

*The substan-  
ce of Mr  
Stillingfleets  
Answer,*

33. This Question, Saith he, *how we know Scripture to be Scripture, may import two things. First, how we know that all those books contain God's word in them? Or secondly how we know, the Doctrine Contained in these Books to be Divine? If you then ask me, whether it be necessary that I believe with such a Faith, as is built upon Divine Testimony, that these Books called Scripture, contain the Principles of the Iewish and Christian Religion in them, which we call God's word, I do and shall deny it (viz. That This belief is built on any Divine Testimony) and my reason is, because I haue sufficient ground*

for an Assent without any Diuine Testimony. But if you ask me  
on what ground, I beleue the Doctrin to be Diuine which is contain-  
ed in those books; I then Answer affirmatiuely, on a Diuine Testimo-  
ny, because God hath giuen abundant Euidence, that this Doctrin was of  
Diuine Reuelation.

34. Here are two Assertions. The first is, That the Books  
of Scripture contain God's Word in them, And this cannot be believed  
vpon any Diuine Testimony. Thus much granted, It followes  
inevitably. Though one should pertinaciously reiect the whole  
Canon of the old and new Testament, or absolutely as-  
firm, These Books, and all the particular Sentences contained in them,  
are not God's Written word, He could not yet for such a per-  
uerse Denial, be accounted an Heretique. I Proue it. No-  
one can incur the guilt of Heresy, but he who denies a Truth  
which God has reuealed, or which stand's firm vpon a Diuine  
Testimony. But he that denies the Books of Scripture to con-  
tain God's Word in them, renounceth no Truth reuealed by  
Almighty God, For, Saith our Aduersary, this is no reuealed  
Truth, nor stand's firm vpon any Diuine Testimony, Therefore  
he is no Heretique. Now further, if he may without the  
sin of Heresy deny these Books to be Diuine, Seing God  
 neuer said so, It is impossible to beleue the Doctrin therein  
contained to be Diuine, vpon any Diuine Testimony, yet Mr Stilling-  
fleet thinks he may.

*Drowes an  
ill Conse-  
quence as-  
sumed.*

*Heresy not  
incurred,  
though one  
denied the  
Books of  
Scripture to  
be Diuine.*

35. My Reason is. No man vnderstand's by the Books  
of Scripture which contain the Principles or Doctrin of the Iewish  
and Christian Religion, to be meerly the Paper or Couer of  
the Books, but he must vnderstand, if he rightly conceiues  
what Scripture is, the very Principles and Doctrin contained in  
these Writings. For example. Here is one Principle in the  
old Testament. Gen. 17. 4. God made a Conuenant with Abra-  
ham and his seed for ever. Another in the New. Iohn. 1. 14.  
The Word is made Flesh. Answer I beseech you? Can any  
man truly affirm, that these two Principles (the like is of in-  
numerable others contained in Scripture) stand not firm vpon

*What is to  
be vnder-  
stood by the  
Books of  
Scripture?*

340 Disc. 3. C. 6. Mr Stillingfleet solves not

Principles of  
Religion de-  
nyed.

God's infallible Testimony, when T<sup>is</sup> manifest, the whole Christian world is obliged to believe them, with a Faith grounded vpon the same infallible Testimony, that reuealed them. It was Therefore no little Ouerficht in Mr Stillingfleet to Speak here of the Principles of the Iewish and Christian Religion, contained in a Book called Scripture, And positiuely to Assert, these cannot be believed vpon a Diuine Testimony. This certainly is not Defensible.

An Answer  
to such as  
here distin-  
guish

Between the  
bare words  
and the sen-  
se.

Words are  
Diuine.

36. Some may yet Reply. Two things are here to be considered. First the bare letter or outward words of Scripture, and these we believe not vpon Diuine Reuelation, but haue them from vniuersal Tradition, or the consent of Nations. The second, is the Sense or Diuine Doctrine which these outward Signs or exterior words Conuey to vs. Now this Sense or the interior Doctrine of Scripture, as contradicting from the bare outward letter, we purely believe vpon the Diuine Testimony, casting the Assent giuen to the Words vpon other forrain Principles. I believe Mr Stillingfleet elsewhere Saies some such thing as this, or must say it. Contra. 1. The meer outward words though pure, are no Books of Scripture, And as separated from the Sense and interior Doctrine, are neither Principles of the Iewish or Christian Religion, nor in *rigour Gods Word*, For God neuer spake nor inspired others to write words, but he iointly conueyed with them his own Sense, and Doctrine also. And Methinks its very hard to believe this Doctrine. *This is my beloued Son* as Gods sacred words, and not to believe those very words to come from God, vpon the same Diuine Motiue which Support's the Doctrine. Moses, saith our Sauour. *Iohn. 5. 47.* Has written of me. And if you will not believe his Writings, how will you believe my Words? These outward Signs therefore, the very words of truth, called by the Apostle. *1. Thess. 2. 13. Verbum auditum Dei.* Words of hearing, or heard, are in very deed the Words of God; and consequently may well, where none can rationally doubt of their Purity, be assented to vpon the same

Disc. 3. C. 6. His Aduersaries Argument. 341

Diuine Testimony, with the Doctrine contained in

37. The Reason is. God would haue been the same Verity he now is, although he had reuealed nothing, that therefore which moues or determin's Belieuers to assent to the truths reuealed is not only his increated Authority, but the former external Reuelation with it also. These Two jointly concur as one Motiue, whence it is that the First Verity, as speaking, or Reuealing, may be rightly called the Formal Object of Faith. I know Diuines vary about this Question. Whether the external Proposition be à partial Motiue with Gods internal Verity, or only à necessary condition whereby that Verity, (the ultimate ground of faith) is applyed to Belieuers, herein much may be *de Nomine*: But none of them all Say, The exterior Reuelation is assented to vpon one Principle which is not Diuine, and that the Doctrine conueyed by it, is believed vpon another most Diuine and infallible. This is à novelty. Neither do I see, how Sectaries can find that Lustre, that Majesty and Diuinity, so often talk'd of in the purest words of holy Writ, if they be not owned as Gods true words vpon his Diuine Testimony.

The First  
Veritas Speaking is the  
Object of  
Faith.

Vbi Secta-  
ries should  
grand.

38. Let vs now briefly examin Mr Stillingfleet's Proposition, without depending on what he teaches or must teach, concerning the belief of words separated from the Doctrine. *VVe believe*, Saith he, *the Doctrine contained in the Books of Scripture vpon à Diuine Testimony*, because God has giuen abundant Evidence, that this Doctrine was (or is) of Diuine Reuelation. Here are three things Distinguishable. The Doctrine Belieued, The Incarnation for example. The Testimony reuealing the matter believed, and finally the Evidence whereby that Testimony is brought to light. Now all our difficulty is concerning the Evidence of this Diuine Testimony wherevpon we believe any Mystery, and we Ask from whence Mr Stillingfleet takes his Evidence (He has you se abundance of it) wherewith to proue that God euer Said. *The Diuine Word was made flesh?*

The Doctrin  
in is selfe  
examined.

Yyy 3

39: The

*The Divine  
Testimony,  
not its own  
Self eviden-  
ce.*

*Therefore  
the Evidence  
of its Creds-  
ibility must  
be taken  
from extrin-  
sick Motives.*

*Fallible Tra-  
dition no  
sufficient E-  
vidence.*

39. The Question seem's reasonable, because this Testimony which all ought to believe, and consequently doth Exist, is not it's own *Self evidence*, nor can it be evidenced by another Testimony of Scripture (wholly as obscure to vs) that God spake that Truth, For so we should goe in *infinitum* and Prove one dark Testimony by another equally as dark. Infallible Tradition not written, and the infallible Authority of the Church our Aduersaries reiect, And may Say, Both (though admitted) are Objects of faith, and consequently vnder *that Notion* appear as little Evident to vs, as the Scriptures Testimony is, we desire to proue. Therefore whatever is rightly called *Evidence* in this matter, whereby all would discover an obscure Testimony (not yet proued God's word) must of necessity be extrinsecal to the Testimony it selfe, and if extrinsecal, no other Evidence can Possibly be had, but that which arises from the known Motives of Credibility, For by these the Church is proued an Oracle no lesse Infallible, then those first Masters of Christianity were. Wherefore Mr Stillingfleet is constrained whether he will or no, if he giues in any thing like Evidence, to make vse of these good *mutu things* the Motives of Credibility, which he scornfully call's *Coleworts* too often serued vp, or shall neuer proue that God once said. *The Divine Word is made flesh.* Which is to Say, *He must first evidence à Church, before he Proves those Words Divine.*

40. It may be replied; His Evidence for the whole Book of Scripture and euery particular sentence in it, is taken from the fallible Tradition of all called Christians, and others also no Christians. I say fallible, For he owns none Diuine or Infallible. *Contra.* 1. The Scripture was acknowledged Diuine, before men agreed so vniuersally that it was Diuine, Tradition therefore, which is rather an Effect of our Christian Beliefe concerning Scripture, then à proof of it, presupposes some other more clear foregoing Evidence, whereby the Book was anciently owned as Diuine. This we enquire after, and very reasonably; because the Chineses haue à vniuersal Tradition for their

their Bible, and the Turks for their Alcoran one also general, yet such a humane, fallible and weak Tradition proues not those Books to be Diuine. *Contra. 2.* And here is an Argument *ad Hominem*. If Mr Stillingsfleet belieues the Testimonies of Scripture Infallible, vpon fallible Tradition which may be false, he makes his Conclusion concerning the belief of every Passage in Holy Writ, far more sure then the Prelimies are which lead in the Conclusion, And this Doctrin he reiects above as improbable. *Contra. 3.* He has neither vniuersal Tradition for the Protestants Canon of Scripture (disowned by more then half of the Christian world) much lesse for its true Sense, wherein dissenting Christians so much vary, that none of them all can Say vpon humane or fallible Tradition, what the true meaning of the Holy Ghost is, and consequently this very Tradition, as also Mr Stillingsfleets double Resolution of Faith into the Books of Scripture, and into the Doctrin, or Sense, come iust to nothing.

41. Page. 158. He Argues the whole Church consist's of men subiect to errour, That is, All the Parts are liable to mistake, Ergo the whole Church cannot possibly be infallible, *in and of it selfe*. Answ. Lay open these couered Terms, *in and of it selfe*, The Argument loses force. I Say therefore, Men meerly considered as nature has made them fallible in order to belieue Supernaturally, haue *in and of themselves* no immunity from errour, yet taken vnder another Notion, as they constitute a Church, they are infallible. That is. There was, is, and will euer be a Church Teaching, and a Church Taught, Infallible, So that all shall neuer err in Faith. You may easily reioyn. This or that man, these or those Multitudes may wilfully abandon Christ's Doctrin. Too true God knows: And if so, They are no more members of the Church, but Heretiques or Infidels. Again. If you run over the rest of Christians remaining Orthodox (whether Pastors or People) and Say these may also fall from Faith; I Answer Some may, All cannot, because God has promised euer

An Argument ad hominem.

Sectaries haue no vniuersal fallible tradition for their Scripture.

A fallacious Objection. Solved.

Some may err All the Church, cannot.



544 Disc. 3 C. 6. Mr Stillingfleet solves not &c.

to preserve a Church in Being, I mean faithful Teachers and faithful Believers, to the end of the world. And must not Sectaries acknowledge thus much, who hold a Church infallible in Fundamentals, which vpon that account cannot wholly err?

42. Mr Stillingfleet Answer's, Though the Authority of the whole Church be not Diuine, yet she cannot err in Fundamentals, *because she is tyed to the vse of means.* Say, Good Sir, who tyes Her to this infallible vse of Mean's, if the whole Moral Body and euery Member of it be fallible? Grant that God by his special Assistance ties Her fast, She is for that reason infallible, and must Vse the means: Take from Her diuine Assistance, and Say She is only guided by the erring Conceptions of fallible men, She may easily swerue from the Means, and reuolt from Christ. And thus the fallacy is cleared. You, Sr, Suppose the Infallibility must be taken from the right vse of means, wheras the contrary is true. *Viz. Therefore she rightly vses the means, because she is antecedently preserved infallible by Diuine Assistance.* You suppose again, that all the Parts of this Assisted Church are fallible, And we Say no, For as long as they continue members of it; So long as the Pastors lawfully commissioned teach in Christ's name, and the faithful belieue their infallible Doctrin (There will be euer such a Church on earth) So long they are all infallible. If any fall from Faith, whether few or many, These, *eo ipso*, cease to be Members of this Mystical Body, yet the Church fail's not, for the failing of some, infer's not a possible Failure in all. The want of this Distinction caused your error.

43. And thus hauing removed such weak difficulties out of the way (thought great ones in that 5<sup>th</sup> chapter) which to an vn wary Reader may seem to Obstruct the Catholick Resolution of Faith, We will in the following Discourse, first Promise some Principles much auailing to conceiue the easest Resolution, and next declare where the chiefeft difficulty lies which Mr Stillingf. has not done, and finally endeavour to solve

*The fallacy  
discover'd,*

*They rightly  
use the  
Means, be-  
cause antec-  
edently made  
Infallible.*

*Difficulties  
removed, we  
proceed to  
the Resolu-  
tion.*

folue it, without the least danger of any vicious Circle. After-  
ward we shall proue that Protestants haue no Faith at all to  
solue.

## CHAP. VII.

*Necessary Principles premised to the Resolution of Faith.*

*God can Speak in a Language proper to Himselfe.*

*His external language is twofold. VVhen*

*God speaks not immediatly, He must  
be heard by his Oracle. VVhat the  
exact Resolution of Faith implies?*

1. **T**He first Principle. God who is an Infinite verity  
and speak's not to stones, can by a Diuine Language  
proper to himselfe, so make his interiour mind and sincere  
meaning known to rational creatures, that all vpon hearing His  
voyce may without hesitation indubitably, Say. Thus God Iudges,  
his be Speak's, which granted. All are obliged both readily and  
firmly to yeild assent to so great a Maiesty for his own Authority.  
The reason hereof is clear. If God can speak to Mortals, and  
for this end that he be vnderstood, there arises an obligation  
in every one to belieue him without fear or doubt, Or in case  
it be impossible after all humane industry vsed, to learn what he  
speak's, none can absolutely belieue him.

*God's proper  
language*

*Known to  
all.*

2. A. 2. Principle. Then (and not otherwise) this external  
Language is certainly known to come from God, when it is spo-  
ken in his name, and so fairely appear's by its own Signatures,  
lustre, and Wonders, to proceed from him, That all must con-  
fesse an infinite Goodnes cannot permit, either Diuel or false

222

Prophet

*How this  
Divine  
Language is  
known to  
proceed  
from God?*

Prophet to use the like way of Speaking, I mean by Signs peculiar to God, and withal to utter a falshood in his name? For were this possible, we infringe the greatest Evidences which Christianity has, and must Say, though Christ our Lord and his Apostles Significantly spake to all in God's name by their wonders, and Miracles, Yet neither Jewes nor Gentils could be obliged (after a clear discovery of them) to believe that they were sent from God, To teach the world.

*By one  
Example,  
Gods immediate way of  
speaking,*

*is declared,*

*The language known to  
proceed from  
God, and  
why?*

3. Now because this external Language is twofold, First Private and Immediate. 2. Publick and Mediate, both for our better Satisfaction are to be declared. Concerning the first. Imagine that one like another Moses were in a Desert, and saw a Bush burn, yet not consumed, Drawing neerer he hears one Speak out of the flame, and Asking who it is? it is Answered. *I am God that speak's*, and command thee to believe and deliver to all what I Say, And to Evidence that I am God, I fore-tell thee now things, which shall happen in thy dayes. Besides thou shalt see these wonderful Signs to confirm this Truth, that I Speak. Put thy hand into thy bosome, it shall become leperous, and presently pure again, Cast thy rod upon the ground I'll make it a Serpent, and without delay turn it into what it was before. And if these Signs move thee not, look into the next Thicket, there is one lies dead, barbarously slain by his Enemies, this man I will raise up to life, and thy own eyes shall see the Miracle. For these wonders therefore, thou must believe, I am God who speak's, and know it belongs to my Providence not to permit such a signalized Language to passe from me, vnless it were mine. Thus we haue Gods priuate and immediate way of speaking.

*The way of  
Speaking by  
another.*

4. Hereupon this retired man leaues his Solitude, goes abroad, and publisheth to all what he has heard and seen, but yet gains no credit. He then tells his incredulous Auditors, God has sent him as a Messenger to speak in his name, and proues his Commission by working strange Wonders. He cures the sick, dispossesses Devils, raises the Dead, which done, the most obdurate hearts Assent to what he teaches, and believe he is no Impostor; but  
a Mes-

Messenger indeed sent from God, For none, as that Prince amongst the Iewes argued aboue. *Iohn. 3. 1.* can say he comes from God, and work such wonders, vnless God be with him. And this is God's publick way of speaking by another.

5. A. 3. Principle. Whoouer grant's that God can speak to man by an Oracle distinct from himselfe, must also (if so great a Maiesty pleases not to impart his truths *immediatly*) hold it Obligatory, to hear the *Mediate* Language of that Oracle, whereby God speak's.

what we are obliged to, if God speak's not immediately.

6. Imagin now, you had an earnest Seeker after Truth, à meer Stranger to Christ, yet thoughtful of à long Eternity, that look's about him, and is resolu'd to find out what God has spoken by the best Oracles. He read's Aristotle, Plato, and the like ancient Philosophers, And ponders all most diligently. What follows? Some few Sparks of light he finds there, but so mix'd with darkness and errour, that the ill Lustre of it, leaues him quite dissatisfied. Perhaps he may hope to learn more from Mahomet's Alcoran. Worse Success here. For no sooner has he the Book in his hands, but the impudent lies, the horrid Impostures, the filth and contradictions discover'd there, so disquiet his troubled soul, that he curses the Book, And rightly Conclud's so foul a language, could neuer come from God. Inquiring moreover who this Mahomet was? He learn's, he was à Counterfeit, an Ignorant, an vnpure and most cruel man, onely pray-able in this, that he owned *One God*, Though he neuer ador'd him in Spirit and truth.

How à Zealous Inquirer after truth, proceed's?

He meet's first with prophane learning.

7. Thus much done, our Zealous Seeker, hears of à Book call'd the Holy Scripture, highly reuerenced by Christians. He reads and reioyces, for now he meets with à language befitting God, *grauè, simple, familiar*, yet withall *serious*. The Doctrin and Precepts of the book appear also most sacred, But one doubt occur's Concerning the strange Miracles and wonders in the old and new Testament. So doth another in no few Passages, which there Seem so obscure, that He vnderstand's them not. However, by what is discover'd, most happy Man were He, could

Fall's next on th Holy Scripture.

doubts occur?

548 Disc. 3. C. 7. Principles premised to

any Ascertain him of the truth of all now perused, And indubitably proue it to be God's own infallible word.

*He seek's  
Satisfaction.*

8. In this restless condition, He proposes the Doubts to one or more of Caluins followers, and Ask's how they proue the Scriptures Diuinity? They tell him the Question is as impertinent, as if he should demand, how light my be known to be light, and not darkness, white to be white, and not black. Much dissatisfied with the Answer, wholly as bad as that other Proof is, taken from the priuate Spirit; The inquisitiue Person hauing heard of a known Christian Society called Catholicks, addresses himselfe to some of the learned among them who pretend to Speak in the name of Christ and the Church, And assure him that God is the Author of Scripture. This yet reaches not home, and though it were further answered, the Church positively teaches so, yet he may iustly demand. How we proue the truth of the Churches Testimony?

*And repairs  
to Catho-  
licks.*

9. Here whilst Sectaries are silent, We proceed as the solitary Man did, and euidence God's own Language spoken by one only Oracle. That is, We lay forth the Motiues mentioned aboue, which illustrate the Church and most prudently conuince, that God speak's by this Oracle. The Motiues are her vndeniable Miracles, the eminent Holiness of life in thousands, the Sanctity and Vnity of her Doctrin, witnessed by the consent of so many different Nations, who all agree, and will agree in one and the same Faith, to the end of Ages. We Add hereunto the Constancy and fortitude of Martyrs, those admirable Conversions the Church has wrought, Her amplitude extended the whole world ouer, and yet to giue more light, We Ask whether euer since the first Creation of things, such multitudes of Professors so well vnited in one Faith, so wise, so learned, so pious and virtuous, can be found in any other Religion not Catholick? Who more exactly complied with the Law they liued vnder, or yielded a readier Obedience to it, then those doe and haue done, that make Profession of the Roman Catholick Faith. The Ingenuous man saith No, and the truth is manifest. The Heathens

*He listens  
to God's  
own language  
Spoken  
by the  
Church:*

# Disc. 3. C. 7. the Resolution of Faith. 349

so notoriously transgressed the Law of nature, that few and very few obserued it. During Moses Law the Church was but little, yet the Peoples sins were great, And if we compare the Learning, Wisdom, and Piety of the Iewes, with the eminent Knowledge, Virtue, and Piety of those who profess the Catholick faith, there is no Parallel. Mention modern Sectaries, diuorced from Christ and his Church, what are they? Men of yesterday, truely Lawless, in a word a very small disioynted company. Their Critical learning appears in their Writings, and the virtue they haue, is best known by their works. Nothing hitherto of God's Language. I mean, no rational Motiues illustrate this Religion.

*No Motiues found in any other Religion but the Catholick.*

10. Thus you se First. How a Seeker after truth may by prudent Industry learn, that the Doctrin contained in Scripture, is Gods own Sacred and Diuine word. But. 2. To be Assured hereof, an Infallible Oracle, euident by Supernatural Signes is to attest the Verity, for so Prouidence has ordered, that Gods own most sublime and Diuine language, must be conueyed to vs by another more plain and easy. The Motiues which illustrate the Church are this plain exterior Language; Induced by them, we hear the Church speak, And vpon her Testimony belieue that other sacred Language of God, deliuered in Holy Writ.

*The last assurance given.*

11. A. 4. Principle. The Resolution of Faith is then exactly made, when all the Causes or conditions wherevpon it depends, are plainly laid forth, vntil we fall vpon the very last Cause or Motiue of our assent, giuen to the Diuine Reuelation. Briefly: The final Cause of belieuing is, that in this our short Exile we liue virtuously, as Faith requires, and after enioy eternal Happines. The material Cause or Subiect of Faith is Man's understanding. The intrinsick Formal cause is no other but Faith it selfe, which as truely makes a soul belieuing, as vision receiued in the retina of the Eye, denominat's it seing. Thus far there is no great dispute, nor much can be questioned concerning the resolution of the very Formal Act of Faith (as distinguished from the *Obiectiue*) which is made by a reflex Contemplation vpon

*what the Resolution of Faith implies? and when exactly made?*



it, as it tend's in to all those causes and Conditions, whereon that act depend's. The only difficulty therefore remaining, concern's the Formal extrinsecal Motiue, which all Say is Gods Diuine Reuelation.

*An easy difficulty*

*Solved upon this Principle, That God cannot cheat the world.*

12. Now one Question may be. From whence haue we Catholicks greater assurance, of our Doctrin, or why Say we That, that stand's firm vpon the Diuine Testimony, and reject the Arians and Protestants Doctrin as à Nouelty, or not built vpon the same foundation, whilst all of vs pretend to Scripture? The Arians say Christ is not the highest God. We assert the contrary. Protestants teach the Church is fallible. We the contrary. In this Opposition of Iudgements, who can certainly Define what God has spoken? To this (and it is the least of difficulties) we Answer. God who cannot deceiue has giuen so many Diuine and manifest Signes, in behalfe of the reuealed Doctrin which the Church teaches, that none can Question the Truth, vnless he will either say: An infinite Wisdom cannot declare his own Interior mind by clear exterior Signs; Or which is worse; That he has established an Oracle, and set it forth with strange Supernatural wonders, only to make à fair Appearance, though the final End be to cheat all that believe it.

13. Now here is the only Question. Whether these Arians, or Protestants, haue any better evidenced Oracle by more, (or equal) Signs and miracles, which teaches their Tenets, then the Roman Catholick Church is, that Teaches ours. Could such an Oracle be evidenced, They might talk of the Assurance of their particular Doctrins, but till this be shown, which will neuer be, silence must proue the best Answer.

CHAP. VIII.

The main Difficulty in the Resolution of Faith, Proposed. What Connexion the Motives haue with the Diuine Reuelation? Of their weight and efficacy. God's own Language not imitable by his Enemies. Faith transcend's the certainty of all Motives. The main Difficulty solued. Of our great Security in Believing God, Though we haue not Euidence of the Diuine Testimony.

1. **T**He real Difficulty in this matter which Mr Stil-lingfleet hitt's not on, is so common to all Christians, that Sectaries are as much, yea more obliged to solue it, then the Catholicks. Thus I propose it. The last Resolution of faith, is made into this Obiectiue Truth. *God has revealed the Incarnation* (the like is of any other Diuine Mystery) but the Reuelation appear's, and must appear Obscure to him that belieues, For Tis neither its own Selfe-Euidence, nor can be evidently applied by any other Medium, especially if the Motives of credibility, haue not infallible connexion with the Diuine Testimony. Thus much supposed, which none can deny, it followes, that the intellectual Faculty, when the Reuelation is obscurely proposed, stand's as it were howering, and cannot, for as much as yet appear's, be more inclined to assent infallibly, then to dissent.

2. If you Say, *We Will after a full Sight of the Reuelation's credibility, certainly determine the vnderstanding to assent super Omnia*, or Infallibly, tis Answered. This seem's impossible:

First

*The Difficul-ty common to all.*

*None knowes Evidently the Mystery of the Trini-ty in it Selfe.*

*The ground of the diffi-culty.*

First, because the Motiues whereby the Object is made credible, can settle in vs no other iudgement, but This. *God's Testimony and the thing attested by it*, are most prudently thought to exist, or appear so highly credible, that it is the greatest folly, not to belieue, But this Iudgement, you se, neither reaches to the *Verity* of the Reuelation *in it selfe*, nor to the matter reuealed, therefore Faith cannot as yet, be elicited.

*The will  
Seem's to  
help nothing  
in this parti-  
cular.*

*The whole  
difficulty  
proposed in  
one Syllogism*

*The Iudge-  
ment of learn-  
ed Divines.*

3. Again. The will cannot moue the vnderstanding to assent to an object, *Sub ratione veri infallibilis*, vnder the Notion of an infallible Truth, vnles manifest reason first conuincs the intellectual Power, that it Exists, and is infallible. But all the reasons preceding Faith, bring with them no such Conuiction, for all are here supposed fallible, Therefore if the vnderstanding yeild's an infallible Assent to that, which is not rationally conuinc'd to be *infallible*, it proceed's temerariouly, and doth more then it can do, for it goes beyond the limits of Prudence; saying. *This is infallibly so, though it has no reason to iudge it infallible.* The force of what is now said, will best appear in this Syllogism. A Truth (though really a truth) Proposed or represented, as obscure, cannot moue the vnderstanding to an infallible Assent, but the Diuine Reuelation is proposed and represented as an obscure truth, *Ergo*, it cannot moue the vnderstanding to an infallible Assent.

4. To Solue this pressing Argument many learned Diuines ascribe, and Methinks most reasonably, so great an Euidence to the Motiues of credibility, so strong a connexion between them and the Diuine Reuelation, that it's impossible to separate what God has conioyned. *Viz. The Truth of his Reuelation*, from the euident appearance, or rather the real Exhibition of so many glorious *Miracles*, so much *blood shedding* for Christ, so great *Sanctity*, *Such innumerable conversions* wrought vpon Millions &c. These and the like Signal wonders, taken arlogether, God cannot permit to be done in his name, and with all their Circumstances to confirm a Faith which tend's to no other end, but Holiness of life and euerlasting happines, vnles the Di-  
uine

the Testimony were really in Being, as these Signs convince.

1. To illustrate more this necessary Truth, be pleased to consider à little; wherein the weight of our Church Motiues lies, and first behold them as they are *Positive Signes*, Miracles, Sanctity, Conuerfions *so positive*, that neither Iew nor Gentil can deny one of them. 2. Carry well in mind this negative Truth also. *The want of Arguments to the Contrary*. I would Say; Nothing like à rational Proof can be alleged against them, but what equally discredit's the admirable Wonders of Christ, and his Apostles. Add herevnto. 3. That no Society of men, be they Heathens, Iewes, or Hereticks haue hitherto shewen or shall hereafter shew Signes Comparable to these in confirmation of any doctrine apposite to that, which the Catholick Church teaches.

6. From what is here hinted at, and the Principles already laid, I Discourse farther. God can speak to creatures in à Language worthy himselfe, and so proper to his own great Majesty, that no false Prophet can forge, counterfeit, or perfectly imitate it. The Assertion seem's manifest, For if his own Language be forgeable, or imitable by Enemies, It is impossible to judge by any Sign, whether he, or the Diuel speaks. Nay, it followes clearly, that God Cannot speak at all in à Language worthy himselfe, or powerful enough to gain Belief, For if His voyce be not distinguishable from that of an Enemy, How Shall men yeild à surer Assent to God when He speaks, than to an Impostor that speak's like him?

7. Thus much supposed, these two things follow inuitably, and in right Order. First. Something is certainly signified by these Marks, and signal Motiues manifest in the Church, and consequently they are either God's Voice, or the Diuels: Take which you will. If God's own Voice (for *etiam factis loquitur* now, Saith S. Austin) it is so clear and discernable by it selfe from another coggging Gypsie Language, that all may know it

A a a a

proceeds

*Where in  
the force of  
Church Mo-  
tiues lies.*

*God's exte-  
rior voyce,  
not imitable  
by the Diuel,  
or any false  
Prophet.*

*Church Mo-  
tiues cer-  
tainly Speak  
Something.*

*what follows, if the Language of the Motives be an illusion*

*God either Speaks by them, or Christianity Perishes.*

*The Connexion asserted follows from hence.*

*Faith not Evident, though the Motives have an Essential Connexion.*

proceed's from God : Or if this cannot be known, it avails him not to speak, when the language he utters, cannot possibly be discerned to be his. Contrarywise, if you say The whole Aggregation of Motives are à meer illusory language of God's professed Enemies, you vndoe all, you destroy the Evidene of Christianity, you annul our Sauours most glorious Miracles, and render the Apostles admirable wonders, not only insignificant, but contemptible to Iewes and Gentils. Let therefore the man appear in publick who dare boldly Assert. *All the illustrious Motives and marks of the Catholick Church* (which as I said certainly signify something) are the Language of Diuels, or false Prophets, when it is evident they induce to belieue à Doctrin most Pious and sacred. If you Affirm, Christianity goes to wrack. Say no, or acknowledge such supernatural Signes to proceed from God, we haue enough, the very Lustre of it them so discountenances and abashes. Hereby that it appear's, as t. truly is, in the highest measure improbable.

8. Hence we see (T'is the second inference, and the chieffest thing I aym at) an inseparable Connexion between these supernatural Signes, and the thing signified, I mean between the Motives and the Diuine Reuelation : For if it be certain, that such Signes proceed from God (which is indubitable, vnless either Diuel or false Prophet fource them) None can doubt, but that God's interior Reuelation actually exist's, as the Motives Morally Evident, do Conuince.

9. You will Say, If the Motives haue an Infallible Connexion with Gods internal Reuelation, that very Reuelation, and Consequently the Mystery Reuealed, must also appear evident in Them'selues, to all Belieuers, And so faith would be Evident. I deny the Consequence, because the Assent given to that Connexion, which implies the highest Moral certitude conceivable vnder the degree of most strict Evidene, is Science and not Faith, For it saies no more but thus much. The Diuine Reuelation, *not seen in it Selfe*, but only by the light of external Signs, is, by virtue of these Signes, made *evidently Credible*, Now this evidence, Faith,

*Faith* leaues, Or laies aside, And firmly adheres to the Diuine Reuelation only for it *Self*, as *Contradistinct* both from the Moral Euidence of the Motiues, and their apparent Connexion with the Reuelation.

10. The reason is taken from the Notion of Faith, which essentially tend's obscurely vpon its own Obiect, as the most ancient Fathers assert, whose words, because known to Euery one, I waue at present, and will only mind you of what some Protestants teach. *Faith*, Saies one, and the *Two-lights* seem to agree in this Properly, that a mixture of darknes is requisite to both; With too resulgent light, the one vanishes into knowledge; as the other into day. Thus much granted, 'tis clear, that no Euidence of the Testimony assented to, can moue to Faith, not only because we should in the case of Euidence be necessitated to belieue, But vpon this account also, that the certitude of Faith, taken from the *Supremest Verity*, is of a higher Strain, and far surpasses all the certitude we find in Nature, or in the Motiues inducing to belieue: For were it possible, as it is not, that these Motiues, and all the preuius Proofs leading to Beliefe, could deceiue, it is yet more impossible, that God's infinite Veracity deceiues any. Now by Faith, we lay hold vpon this most *Supreme*, or, All-comprehending Infallibility proper to God alone, not communicable to any creature. And in this sense, Faith far transcend's the Certitude of the forementioned Connexion, which is known to be Infallible by Natural Discourse only.

11. It is true, The more eident these Motiues appear the better they induce to belieue, yet for that reason haue lesse to doe with the very act of Faith, which, as I sayd, rest's vpon, and laies claim to no lower a Verity then the most *Pure and Supreme* only, And if it rest's not here, it is no Faith. I say, *Supreme* and *Pure*, and for this reason also, we exclude the connexion between the Motiues and Diuine Reuelation, from the Formal obiect of Faith, because the Connexion implies a *Complexum*, or Mixture of two things known *Scientifically*, and therefore is vnmeet to ground Faith. One may reple. The exteriour words of Scripture taken with the Diuine Testimony

The nature and tendency of Faith.

The excellency of it surpasses all created Certitude.

Faith relies vpon the most pure and supreme Verity.



556 Dise. 3. C. 8. *The main Difficulty in the*

*The same  
thing known  
and believed*

are Objects of Faith, therefore these Motiues assented to vpon the same Testimony can, also terminate Faith, For we all believe that the Church is Holy and Vniuersal. Answ. Very true, because the same thing can be *Scitum & Creditum*, both known and believed vpon different Motiues. known by the force of reason, which see's the Connexion between the One and the Other, and believed also vpon pure Reuelation. Thus we know the Existence of God by the works manifest in nature, and withall believe it vpon his own sole word, or the Diuine Testimony.

*How we  
trust God  
by Faith.*

12. Vpon these Principles we Answer to another Obiection. To believe, Say some, is to trust God whom we believe, which is impossible, if his outward words, or exteriour Signes be necessarily connexed with his interiour speaking. For how can we trust, when an absolute Assurance, is had of his Testimony? Answ: This is done very easily, when the Assurance giuen is extrinsecal to the Testimony, and far inferiour to the Supereminent Infallibility of God that speaks. Now this *Motiu* only, and no lesser certitude ground's supernatural Faith. In a word we trust, because we transcend all created Certitude and rely vpon the most Supreme Verity, by an Obscure Assent of Faith.

*Church  
Motiues  
promoued  
efficaciously.*

13. Others, Obiect. 3. We suppose all this while, the Motiues inducing to believe more perswasive and efficacious, then can be euinced by reason: For why may not God separate the exteriour appearance of a Miracle from the reallity of it, And So permit the Diuel to delude vs all? I Answer. 1. This Criticism first reuerfes the most glorious Miracles which Christ euer wrought. I Answer. 2. Though the appearance and reallity of a Miracle be separable, yet the euident Signes of Sanctity manifest in innumerable, The Euident Appearance of whole Nations conuerted to the Catholick Faith, are inseparably conioyned with the reallity of interiour Sanctity, and real interiour conversions. Now in the weighing these Motiues, One is not to be thought of singly, but pondered with the rest; Altogether indubitably euince, that God speak's by them: Or if you Still Deny, Say I beseech you, whose language they are? I Answer 3. The absolute

*All Collec-  
tively taken,  
most Con-  
vincing.*

Absolute Power of God cannot permit (If He positively intend's not to lead all into error) That a false Miracle be wrought and done in his name, to confirm a Doctrine suitable to his Goodness, and the increase of Holyness. In this Case therefore, The Miracle must be real without guile and deceit, For were this countenance possible, God could haue no language proper to Himselfe, Contrary to what is already proued. Thus much premised.

God cannot cheat any by a false Miracle.

14. We are to solve the Difficulty another way, perhaps more plain and easy, And therefore distinguish with Diuines, a twofold certitude in euery act of Faith. The one (called the Certitude of Infallibility) arises from the supernatural Principles which concur to the very act of Belief, And these not liable to error, can neuer operate but when the Diuine Reuelation really is. This certitude may be had, though we no more experience or know it by any reflex Consideration, than One who is directly moved by the Holy Ghost to write a Truth, need's to know that he is diuinely assisted; And it implies not only the mere Truth of the Act, but moreouer an infallible Determination to truth; The other called, *Certitudo adhesionis*: or a firm Adhesion belongs to the Believer, and is not grounded on Euidence, as it fall's out in Science, but vpon most prudent Motiues proposed to Reason (which clearly discovered) the Will by her pious Affection commands, and determines the intellectual Faculty to Assent indubitably, For, *corde creditur ad iustitiam*. Rom. 10. The Heart or Will can thus further and incline the mind to yeild, when it's euident credible, that God speak's, and eternal Saluation depend's vpon an assent, which is giuen without fear or hesitation.

The Difficulty solved another way

A twofold Infallibility explained.

The heart or will furthens our Assent.

15. S. Bonauenture eminent for Sanctity and Learning. 3. Dist. 23. art. 1. Quest. 4. speak's most pertinently and profoundly to my present purpose. *Est certitudo speculationis, & est certitudo adhesionis* &c. There is, Saith he, a speculative certitude and a certitude of adhesion, or of cleauing fast to what we believe. The first has respect to the intellectual power, the other to

S. Bonauenture.

358 Disc. 3. C. 8. *The main Difficulty in the*

*Both clearly  
distinguishes  
and.*

*Explain's  
this twofold  
Infallibility.*

*Faith no Spe-  
culative ope-  
ration.*

*Hereticks  
without Mo-  
tives, assent  
to fooleries.*

*What force  
she will  
have.*

the pious Affection of the Will. If we speak of this firm adhesion, it is far greater in faith, then in Science, because faith makes him that believes more certainly to adhere to the truth revealed, then Science doth, to any thing known. Hence we see, that men truly faithful, cannot by Arguments Torments, or inticements be inclined to deny in words a believed Verity, which rare in his Wits will doe for a thing he knows, vnless it be vpon this account that faith dictates, he is not to Lye. *Stultus etiam esset Geometra &c.* A Geometrician would be very vnwise, who for any certain Conclusion would vndergoe death (as thousands haue done for their faith). Whence it is that one truly Faithful, though highly learned in natural knowledge, would rather lose it all, then deny one only Article of Faith, so strong is his adhesion to truth believed. What this great Doctor Asserts, need's no further Probation, For if it be certain (as all confesse) that Faith is no speculative knowledge grounded purely vpon Euidence, (discouerable in the Diuine Reuelation) it must of necessity be a practical Assent in order to the effects now mentioned, of suffering, and dying for Diuine Reuealed Truths, when occasion is offered: Now that such an Assent may be elicited vpon Prudent Motiues has no difficulty, whilst we see condemned Heretiques by meer pertinacy, so Stiffly fastened to their Errours without Motiues, that it is very difficult to make a Diuorce between Heresy, and their Phanxies.

16. One may obiekt first. The vnderstanding cannot practically Assent to a thing as indubitably true by any Command of the Will, when this Power is vtterly vnable to change the nature of Motiues, or to make them appear otherwise then they are, That is, highly Probable, yet vncertain. I Answer (to omit that Heretiques without Motiues, pertinaciously assent to meer fooleries) The Will can with another Help (whereof more presently) Supply the inefficacy of those intellectual Lights, which prudently euince this truth. It is evidently credible that God speak's by the Signs laid before mee. God's peculiar Language, his Seal and Signature appear more clearly in these Euidences, than in any Princes commission sent me, When I see his own Seal and Hand Writing. O, but

lay yet  
in the  
know  
mour fu  
ged to  
the Spe  
quires  
That,  
makes  
suprem  
then d  
uation  
self ob  
fables,  
he cou  
early  
from t  
rable a  
Nobly  
time h  
at all.  
17.  
Securi  
dent J  
of,  
living  
in. It  
fore c  
I know  
tainty  
his w  
18.  
re pri  
mide  
initial

Yet we haue not Euidence of his Testimony. No thanks to thee poor Creature, to Assent, had'st thou Euidence. Know therefore His Maiesty is too far aboue vs all, to humour such à Curiosity. As reasonable creatures we are obliged to submit our iudgement to his, though it be not eident he Speak's, for this Duty the highest Power imaginable requires of vs (who infinitely surpasses all created Excellence) That, vpon à most credible Appearance of his speaking, when nothing makes the contrary probable, we yeild an Assent answerable to his supreme Excellence, that is firme, certain, and Infallible. Who then dare stand trifling in so weighty an Affaire as concern's Salvation? Or, who dare tell our glorious God? Lord, I find my self obliged to belieue, And Se great Soueraign the Signes and Testes, Witnesses of your Speaking, Yet because all possibly may be counterfeited, I will, like one little Loath to yeild, deal both warily and Sparingly with you; You shall haue no other faith from me, but what is faint and meagar; In fine, à poor miserable and moral certain Assent. Is this think ye to proceed Nobly with God? No. If we belieue, our faith ought to shew his great Worth and Dignity, or really we belieue not at all.

17. From what is Said, Two things follow. 1. That our Security is greater whilst we belieue God, induced by most prudent Motiues, though we se not the Euidence of his Testimony, Than to belieue the most eident Assertion of any man liuing, esteemed one of the very best Reputation. The reason is. If God speak's, I am certain he deceiues not, And therefore cannot mistrust his Veracity, But If man speak's, whom I know liable to errour and deceit, The main ground of Certainty fail's, For though I hear his voice and haue euidence of his words, yet neither giue me absolute Assurance of Truth.

18. The Question therefore is? Whether I may not more prudently belieue God who cannot deceiue, though I want evidence of his Testimony, than to belieue man, that by errour or mistake may deceiue, when I haue only Euidence of his outward words,

*As reasonable  
Creatures,  
we are  
Obliged to  
submit*

*Vpon à Cre-  
dible appear-  
ance of  
God's speak-  
ing.*

*Two Cer-  
tainities com-  
pared toge-  
ther.*

*The differ-  
ence, declared  
words,*

words, which are separable from Truth? In the one case *words are evident*. And I haue with them some degree of *moral certainty* concerning Truth. In the other; I haue infallible certainty of truth (If God speak's) and the highest moral Assurance imaginable of his speaking, before I belieue.

*Faith quite  
different  
from Science*

19. It followes. 2. That Euidence in the formal Object assented to, is inconsistent with Faith, which implies a prudent, and withall a most infallible practical Assent in order to an *apprehensive Esteem of the Will*, and those effects, mentioned by S. Bonauenture. Therefore it is of a quite different nature from Science, whose tendency is Speculative, and sees clearly the Object assented to. But I know some will yet require further Satisfaction in this hard matter. I shall endeavour to comply with their wish, in the next Chapter.

## CHAP. IX.

*The whole Progress of Faith explained in order to its  
last Resolution. Of that which the Fathers  
Call the light of Faith. Its wholly differ-  
rent from Sectaries Private Spirit.  
From whence Faith hath Infalli-  
ble Certainty. Objections  
Solved.*

*Faith comes  
by hearing.*

1. **F**Alth faith the Apostle. Rom. 10. 17. Comes by Hearing. Again. V. 14. How shall they hear without a Preacher? But how shall they preach unless they be sent? All then must hear the Diuine Verities and belieue what they hear taught, by men lawfully sent to preach. Now because God has been pleased

Disc. 3. C. 9. In Order to its Resolution. 361

to speak by different Oracles, anciently by his Prophets, by Christ  
 our Lord, his Apostles, and finally by the Church (altogether  
 make up but one School as it were of Diuine learning) His  
 whole endeavour euer was in all ages to haue this truth Taught  
 by these Oracles. viz. God is the Author of the Doctrins which all  
 are obliged to believe, and to make thus much highly Credible,  
 He neuer sent as I said aboue, Prophet, Apostle, or Christ himself to  
 teach, but iointly Authorised them to show the Royal Signes  
 and Seals of his own Soueraignity, Miracles I mean, and other  
 Supernatural wonders, whereby they were proued commissioned  
 Oracles, to speak in the name of God.

One great  
 Truth to be  
 heard.

1. To our present purpose therefore. None can believe,  
 unless he hear. Which is to Say: That *Viâ ordinariâ* before the  
 Hearer elicits Supernatural faith, à natural Proposition of the  
 Mystery reuealed, necessarily precedes that Assent. Yet more.  
 He that Teaches is not barely to Say. Vnlesse you yeild assent,  
 you will be damned, But he must also propound some Motiue of  
 prudent credibility with the Mystery, which Motiue, so far  
 surpasses all the Power in nature, that it manifestly appears to  
 be God's work, or his own vnimitable language, as is already  
 need.

What ne-  
 cessarily  
 precedes  
 Faith.  
 A natural  
 proposition  
 of the  
 Mystery.  
 with a Mo-  
 tiue about  
 the power of  
 Nature.

2. Besides it is not sufficient that the Preacher tell's vs, God  
 is the Author of his Doctrin, clearly confirmed by Miracles,  
 but he is to make the Assertion morally certain either by wor-  
 king à Miracle Himselfe, as Christ and the Apostles did, or in  
 want of that, to bring in strong Arguments and witnesses, whe-  
 reby it may appear, such supernatural Wonders haue been done,  
 to confirm that God is the Author of his Doctrin. Now this  
 Moral evidence by witnesses, is equiualent to the seeing of Mi-  
 racles done before our eyes, which fall's out in all evidence  
 called Moral, For I am now no lesse assured by most credible  
 witnesses that Cardinal Altieri was elected Pope of Rome, then  
 if I had been present at his Election. After this natural Propo-  
 sition made of any Diuine Mystery, some apprehensions of its  
 Verity (or credibility rather) easily follow in the Hearer, which  
 also are natural.

Moral evi-  
 dence by  
 witnesses.

Bbb b

4. Thus



*The prudent  
Iudgement  
of Credibili-  
ty.*

*God's po-  
werful inni-  
tation to  
believe.*

*The will  
presented by  
grace Com-  
mand's,*

*The intell-  
ectual Faculty  
Obeyes and  
belieues.*

*The Twofold  
voice of God*

*The last &  
voice called  
high lear-  
ning*

4. Thus much done by the Preacher, One desirous to learn truth discourses, and perceiues so great à Concern as Salvation depend's vpon his believing the Mystry proposed, that at last, he is brought to this prudent Iudgement of credibility. *God cannot deceiue the World by such exterior Signs, as are here proposed by this Preacher,* therefore I ought in prudence to yeild my Assent, and believe. Now here enters another Principle; wholly necessary to make Faith certain, which may well be called *the last hearing of Gods Voice, or his powerful Inuitation to believe* with full certitude, and it consists in an interiour *illustration of Grace* imparted to à soul, whereby the Obiect of Faith with its credibility, is represented *another way, more clearly then before*, yet so, that no Mystry is seen evidently.

5. Herevpon, the *VWill* preuented with diuine Grace begin's to work by her Pious affection, after that preuius iudgement had of the Mysteries Credibility, and the interiour Diuine illustration, which is the last speaking of God to à Belieuer. The Will therefore affectioned to the Happines propounded, moues the vnderstanding to elicit most certain Faith, *Super omnia*. The Vnderstanding Obeyes, and forthwith belieues by an infallible Assent the truth of the Mystry, though not seen evidently.

6. Hence you se, This infallible Assent proceed's from à *Twofold Voice of God*. First from the Motiues preuius to Faith, whereby its evidently credible that God speak's, though the Motiues were fallible; But the last Voice of his Diuine illumination, which represent's the Reuelation *more indubitably* than meer Motiues can doe, takes all doubt away, And we come to an absolute certitude in Faith, vpon this interiour sacred language of God, called by the Fathers, *Alta Doctrina*, à high learning, *Celestia Doctrina*. The Language of heauen, which opened Lydia's heart. *Act. 16. 14.* And made her to attend to such things as S. Paule deliuered. And might I here speak à word in passing, I can auouch in all Christian Sincerity, that treating with many reconciled to our Catholick Faith, I haue heard some Ssy (and it was à singular comfort to me) *that such Miracles, so strange*

Conuen-

### Disc. 3. C. 9. In Order to its Resolution. 363

*Conversions*, as the Catholick Church has made, *Her long Continuance*, Maugre all attempts against Her; The eminent Sanctity of innumerable who profess her faith, appear to be Gods own glorious works; But besides these outward lights, which convince much, God (Said these) seem's to Speak to our very hearts; and tell's vs. Truth only is taught by this Oracle, and vpon so clear conuiction, we find our Selues obliged to believe. But as S. Austin profoundly obserues. *Lib. 1. de Prædest. Sanct. Cap. 8. Valde remota est à sensibus carnis hæc Schola, in quâ Deus auditur & docet.* The School where God is heard and teaches, is very remote from flesh and blood.

*Times certain to Faith*

7. Answerable to what is here noted of God's interiour voice by Illumination, the illuminated S. Austin. *lib. 11. Confess. Cap. 3.* speak's most significantly, Where he desires to Hear and vnderstand, How God in the beginning made Heauen and earth. *scripsit hoc Moyses, Scripsit & abijt &c.* Moses wrote this, but he his gone from vs. Now he is not before me, for if he were. I would hold him fast &c. And for your sake intreat him, to lay open these things. I would giue good eare to his words. If he spake in Hebrew, I could not vnderstand him, but if Latin, I should know what he said. But how should I know that he speaks Truth? And if I knew so much, should I know it from him? The Saint Answers. *Intus vtiq; mihi, intus in Domicilio Cogitationis &c.* Inwardly, where my most secret thoughts dwell, Truth verily spoken not in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, or any other barbarous Language, without mouth or tongue, without a rustling noise of words, would tell me. Moses speak's Truth. *Et ego statim intus,* And I presently made certain (Mark wherevpon his last certitude is grounded) would confidently say to that blessed man. *I speak truth.* Thus S. Austin, who in the 8. Chap. now cited, call's this light à *secret Grace*, giuen by God to take away the hardness of hearts in Matters of belief. And his Doctrin is consonant to these, and like Expressions of Holy Scripture. *1. Cor. 4. 6. He hath shined in our hearts, to the illumination of the knowledge of the Glory of God. Esa. 54. All shall be taught of God. Math. 16. Flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father*

*S. Austin confirm's our Assertion.*

*Truth inwardly teaches.*

*Certainty arises from that interiour learning.*

*Scripture speak's fully this Sense.*

which is in Heaven. Iohn. 1. 2. 27. His vocation teaches all things. Iohn. 6. 44. No man can come to me, vnlesse the Father that sent me, draw him. Iohn. 10. My sheep hear my Voice. &c.

The Holy  
Fathers In-  
ferences.

8. From these and many other Passages, The most ancient Fathers, (especially S. Austin and our Venerable Bede) teach that none can Hear, and Assent to the exterior Propositiō of the Diuine Mysteries, vnlesse at the same time the light of Grace work's interiorly, and proposes all after another way more efficaciously. Read S. Austin towards the end of this 8.<sup>th</sup> Chap. at those words. *Cum ergo Euangelium predicatur &c.* Where he tell's you, when the Gospel is preached, some be- lieue and others do not. Those, saith he who be- lieue, when the Preachers outward words sound in their eares, *Intus à pa- tre audiunt & discunt*, interiorly hear Gods own Voice and learn, what he teaches: Others, who be- lieue not, Hear words spoken by the Preacher, but hear not that interior Diuine Lan- guage, and therefore learn nothing.

Chiefly S.  
Austins.

The illustra-  
tion of grace  
supplies the  
Inefficacy of  
Motiues,

And add's  
more Clarity

9. Grant then first, That the Motiues inducing to Faith were supposed fallible, because perhaps we haue no reflex E- uidence of their infallible Connexion with the Reuelation. Grant also, that the exterior Propositiō of Diuine Mysteries, retain's Obscurity. (which is true) yet this *Secret*, this perswasive *illustra- tion of Grace*, (being as I said the last hearing of God's Voice) can on the one Side, supply the inefficacy of the Motiues, And on the Other, so accomplish the Mysteries exterior Proposi- tiō, that it brings faith to its full certitude. Do then the Motiues Shine lesse clearly, or leaue Some Capacities, as it were, in à wauering condition? The illustration giues more light, and driues doubt away. Is the Diuine Testimony, meerly consid- ered according to its outward proposāl, obscure? The Illustra- tiō add's new clarity to it, and makes Faith most certain, yet still without Euidence. *Et ego statim certum*; And by virtue of this light, I say confidently with S. Austin, what I be- lieue, is infallible true.

10. To illustrate yet more this necessary Point (I speak to  
Catho-

Catho-  
dics.  
obedi-  
know  
it fees  
at ma  
now  
that P  
the li  
S. Vi  
withi  
fers  
purpo  
last a  
Doctr  
peak  
spake  
him,  
truth.  
11.  
admit  
the o  
must  
but I  
infall  
ratio  
red t  
ries.  
12.  
faith  
fion  
preh  
re m  
shoul  
only

### Disc. 3. C. 9. In order to its Resolution. 365

Catholicks (Sectaries will not hear me). Read the Angelical Doctor. S. Thomas. 2. 2. quest. 2. a. 3. Where as his manner is, He object's. It is dangerous to giue an assent to things when we know not, whether that which is Propos'd be true or false, as it seem's to fall out in matters of Faith. Ad. 2. he Answers. *Ad man. by his natrual light Assent's to natural Principles, so the virtuous man by the Habit of Faith rightly iudges of what belongs to that Virtue*, And therefore, *per lumen Fidei diuinitus infusum*, By the light of Faith diuinely infused, he assents to the Mysteries. S. Vincentius Ferrerius also in his Sermon, vpon the Sunday within the Octaue of the Epiphany, pondering our Sauours Answers to the Doctors Questions in the Temple, speak's to our purpose and very significantly. Christs words; Saith he, *veniamus ad Cor Doctorum cum lumine*, came to the hearts of those Doctors with light, and they Said. *O verum dicit. The Child speak's Truth*. Again. *Christus loquebatur Diuinâ virtute*, Christ spake with à Diuine virtue, and all the Doctors vnderstanding him, assented. *Pro certo verum dicit*. Most certainly he speaks truth. Thus. S. Vincentius.

The Angelical Doctors Doctrin,

S. Vincen-ius words, conformable

11. The Principle whereon this Doctrin relies, All must admit. Viz. That an act of Faith is wrought in à Soul by the operation of God's Spirit, and therefore the Holy Ghost must not be excluded from that work, which none can doe but He. Now what we Assert in this particular, is, that the infallible certainty of faith comes from this interior Illumination, as it more liuely set's forth the formal Object assented to, or help's to à clearer Proposal of the Diuine Mysteries.

Faith à work of the Holy Ghost.

12. And thus in à word we haue the whole Progres of faith in this present State, explained. First, à natural Proposition of the Mysteries precedes: This beget's à natural apprehension of their Credibility. After some consideration, there may arise an imperfect Iudgement of Credibility: But, should the Will offer as yet, to incline the mind to Assent only vpon what appear's hitherto, it could not moue to à

Bbbb 3

Faith.

*The whole  
Procedure of  
Faith briefly  
laid forth,*

Faith which is an Aſſent *ſuper Omnia*, or moſt certain. Therefore the illuſtration or powerful Inuitation of Grace (by which, as I ſaid, the Obiect appear's another way and more clearly) is infuſed, whereof the ſoul is *Recipient*. The will now after other Preparatiues, thus ſtrengthn'd à new, command's boldly the vnderſtanding to Aſſent vpon the ſafeſt Principles imaginable. Viz. Vpon God's infallible *Reuelation accompanied with his own Diuine light*, which makes Faith to grow higher in certainty, than all the Reason or knowledge in this life, can ariſe to. For as S. Thomas obſerues, Humane knowledge deriues its Certitude from Mans natural Reason, which may Err, but Faith has its infallibility, *Ex lumine Diuina ſcientia* from the light of Gods diuine wiſdom, which cannot deceiue, and therefore is moſt certain.

*The efficacy  
of Diuine  
Light.*

13. Some may Oppoſe. In this Diſcourſe of the Diuine illuſtration, we ſeem to fauour Heretiques, who talk much of their light. It is à ſtrange Obiection, ſaith F. Granado. *Contra. 1. de Fide. Traſt. 1. D. 5.* Whilſt all acknowledge this Light to be, *Gratia per Chriſtum*, à Supernatural grace purchaſed by our Sauour, which raiſes vs aboue the force of natural Principles, and moues to belieue moſt firmly, And the Motiue is, *the Diuine Reuelation it ſelfe, inueſted or appearing, in God's own Diuine Illuſtration.* To what is pleaded in behalf of Hereticks, I Anſwer. Hereticks talk euery whit as much of their Faith, as of their Light. Do we therefore agree with them in faith, becauſe they ſay, theirs is as diuine, as ours? No certainly. For the like ſound of words, implies neither the ſame reality of things, nor any agreement at all. Why then ſhould we fauour the light they pretend to, which like their faith, is à meer illuſion, and no more ſymbolizes with the Illuſtration of Catholicks, then their faith doth with true Faith?

*All Catho-  
licks Ac-  
knowledge  
this Light.*

*Heretiques  
Claim to  
Faith and  
light, makes  
neither Di-  
uine.*

14. I ground my Aſſertion on theſe three Principles. S. Paul ſaith firſt. *No man can belieue vneſſe hee Hear's, nor bea- without à Preacher*, Therefore in this preſent ſtate of things, an exterior Humane Propoſition of the Diuine Reuelation

neceſ-

necessarily precedes the true light of Faith, and that light is not given to believe, *viâ ordinariâ*, vnlesse one authorized to Preach in God's name, Proposes the Reuelation suitable to the natural way of hearing other Verities, by our senses, Imagination, and humane vnderstanding, Otherwise, that would be possible which the Apostle makes impossible. *Viz. To hear and believe without a Preacher.* Now further none can be a fit Minister to propound the Reuelation, but he that makes his Proposition good by a Miracle, or some supernatural wonder, otherwise a meer Impostor, may as well gain credit by Saying he speaks God's truths, as the very best of the Apostles. But no Protestant, is able to doe thus much, none of them all can say with truth. *God has reuealed my particular Doctrin,* add Seal that very exteriour Proposition with a Miracle, As every Preacher in the Catholick Church can do, Therefore the illustration he pleads for is meer Phansy, and nothing els.

15. Again, and here is my second Principle grounded also upon the Apostles words. *How shall they Preach vnlesse they be sent.* Which is to say. He only is fit to Propose Gods Diuine Reuelation, who proues himselfe commissioned to Preach, by Supernatural Signes and indubitable Miracles, For thus Christ our Lord sent by his eternal Father, thus the Apostles sent by Christ, and the Church euer since (all shewing Wonders aboue the force of Nature) proued their Mission, withall euinced, That God only impowred them to teach as they did. Now here is the main point we vrge. Could the Protestant, who certainly neuer yet wrought one indubitable Miracle to countenance his Doctrin, giue in Euidence by some one or other Miraculous work, That an Oracle sent him to teach, He might speak more boldly, But this being impossible, The light he pretend's to, is iust like his doctrin, An *Signum fatuum*, vain and void of all reallity.

16. 3. Our latter Protestants seem to attribute no other certainty to the very act of Faith, then what is moral, and necess.

*The Pretended light of Hereticks Proued an illusion.*

*First because none of them can propound their Doctrin, as warranted by Supernatural Signes.*

*2. They haue no Commission to teach.*



368 Disc. 3. C. 9. *The Progress of faith.*

3. *Their Faith being only moral and fallible, Cannot Proceed from the Holy Ghost.*

*The Catholics faith most certain.*

*A harder Difficulty.*

*Proposed by the Secretary.*

necessarily consequent to à humane fallible Ratiocination, 'Tis much like to the Assent we elicit, when we say *Cesar* or *Pompey* have been in the world. If this Doctrin be defensible, its impossible to declare, how either Faith it selfe, or the illustration preuius, can proceed from the Holy Ghost: For did the Spirit of God work with à Soul, when it belieues, The certainty of Faith, would without all doubt, goe beyond that assurance which is only humane, moral, and fallible. Now wee Say quite contrary, That Faith is an absolute Infallible supernatural Assent, whereby all ought to adhere to Mysteries most profound, or about all humane Reason, And consequently, we deriue its certitude from God's Infallible Reuelation, inuested in his own Divine light, and readily return him à double Obedience of our whole interiour, of the Will, and Vnderstanding together, and belieue most vndoubtedly.

17. One may Obiect. 2. As none can discern true Gold from another mettall very like it, vnlesse there appear's in the Obiects some real Difference, so it is impossible to discern à true Reuelation, from one meerly apparent, or false, by any Diuine light, vnlesse there be an Obiectiue diuersity or discernibility discoverable between them, which cannot be assigned.

18. This Obiection (proposed by no Sectarie) is to the Purpose. To solue it, I must remind you of that Solitary Man Commissioned to preach, after his Vision had in à desert place, who goes abroad, tell's what he had heard and seen in his own natural Language, But gains not belief. He vseth another Idiotism, Speak's in Gods name, and as one sent from God ought to speak, That is, he euidences his Mission by supernatural Signes, work's Miracles, or proues them wrought in confirmation of his Doctrin: All now adore him as à Prophet, All belieue. This Language some Diuines rightly call an extrinssecal Form of speech, which is Supernatural *Quoad modum*, because it contain's wonders done about the force of nature, and proceeds from the Faith of him that teaches, as also from the Belief of the whole Church besides. Please to obserue. As mans natural speech, is apt

Disc. 3. C. 9. In Order to its Resolution &c. 369

to beget in a Hearer a natural knowledge of his internal Conception that speak's, and the thing spoken of, So this Supernatural Language is apt to beget in one well disposed, a Supernatural apprehension of his internal conception that speak's, and the Myſtery likewise spoken of. Now becauſe this exterior Language is God's proper *Form of Speaking* and moſt peculiar to himſelfe, it carries with it *Ex natura rei*, its own *ſignature*, its own *Diſcernibility*, in ſo much that its diſtinguiſhabable from all other wayes of ſpeaking which are falſe, or come not from the firſt Verity. And this peculiar mark of God's ſpeaking, (very diſcoverable) the precious light of Faith perceiues, as moſt different from all other counterfeited Languages. And thus you haue the Obiectiue Diuerſity ſought for, fully pointed at.

*The language of God, whether exterior, or interior*

*Carries with it, its own diſcernibility.*

19. Hence you ſee firſt, That none can propoſe A falſe Myſtery, for example, *the Incarnation of the Holy Ghoſt*, inueſted in all and euery due Supernatural circumſtance, requiſite to be lieue a reuealed Truth. Something appertaining to God's exterior Language, and the natural precious Propoſition, whereof we haue now ſpoken (though both Miracles and Miſſion be falſly pretended) will euer be wanting. You ſe. 2. That when two Myſteries are propounded together, the one falſe, the other true, both in the ſame natural manner, neither of them contain's a ſufficient propoſal Inductiue to ſupernatural Faith, nor can God according to ordinary Providence, giue his Grace to belieue in ſuch Circumſtances, whiſt the Preacher abuſes his function, and teaches things he was not ſent to teach.

*Two Inſtances deduced from this Doctrin.*

## CHAP. X

*The easiest way of resolving Faith, Laid forth in two Propositions. The evidence of Credibility further declared. Sectaries have no Evidence of Credibility. It is as evidently Credible that God now speaks by the Church, as that He did anciently Speak by the Prophets.*

*In to what  
faith is  
resolved?*

*One and  
the same  
Answer  
returned by  
All.*

1. **T**He first Proposition. Faith which comes by exterior Hearing is resolved into the first Verity, speaking by one or more lawfully sent to preach, who proue their Mission, and make their Doctrin evidently credible, by Signes both prudent and supernatural. You haue in this Assertion first, Faith's Formal Object (God's increated verity) specified. You haue. 2. the Appendants requisite to beget Faith briefly hinted at, whereof more presently.

2. If therefore any Ask why we believe this or that Diuine Mystery; The Incarnation for example? Some Answer the belief is grounded vpon vnwritten, or Apostolical Tradition; Others vpon the words of Scripture, others finally recurr to the Churches infallible Testimony. All of them speak but one and the same thing, comprised in these few words. *God saith it, who cannot err*, speaking by One or more, lawfully sent to Preach.

3. Inquire again. But from whence haue we Assurance that God has said the Diuine word was made flesh, for the Doctrin *to vs*, is neither Evidently true, nor Evidently false? I Answer God Himselfe giues infallible Assurance hereof, And who can do

# Disc. 3. C. 10. The Resolution of Faith. 371

do that better then He? Here Faith precisely considered, as an intellectual Assent, finally rests; In so much that if you multiply demands to the world's end, no other Answer can be returned but this only, Eternal Truth *has said it*, or *reueal's that he speak's this Verity*. All further Questions proposed and replies given, though different in sound are really Synonimal. The reason is, because the last Motiue of Faith can haue none before it Selfe, for to run on in *Infinitem* with Motiues and stop no where, is to make no Resolution at all.

*Vpon what Verity Faith finally relies?*

*All further Answers impertinent, the Reason hereof.*

*An Obiection Proposed in the name of à Heathen.*

*It is neither meet for God to giue, nor man to haue euidence of the Mysteries.*

*The reason hereof.*

4. I know à Heathen Philosopher may abuse the Sense of the Apostles words. 1. Cor. 1. 18. And say we now preach foolery indeed, *Gentibus Stultitia*. For what can be more deuoid of reason, then to belieue most infallibly, whilst the mind yet in darkness doth so, hauing by the very act of Faith no euidence why it *beliues infallibly*. I Propose this Obiection in the name of à Heathen, for no Christian, whether Sectary or other, can vse it, because Christian Doctrin teaches, that none can be sau'd without Faith, which as I now said, is neither *Euidently* true, nor *Euidently* false, *ex Terminis*, Therefore all that belieue are ineuitably cast vpon à necessity of chusing à Doctrin whereby Salvation may be attained, though it be not like the first Principles in nature, its own *Selfe-Euidence*.

5. Now to satisfy the Heathen and quiet à mind too inquisitiue after Euidence, both haue what they ask, *Euidence enough*, not of the Truth of the Mysteries in *themselves*, For as on the one side, it is not meet that Gods great Maiesty should impart such an euidence (who I hope may keep the like distance from his Creatures, as Great Monarchs do when they intimate their Command's by only shewing the *seal* and *signes* of Soueraignity to subiects) So on the other side, it is not fit that man haue euidence of the Mysteries, because it is incompatible with à perfect Subiection, with that merit and Obsequiousness which God requires of his rational Creatures, who are to walk to heauen by an humble and dutiful Faith, or shall neuer come thither.

6. And here by the way we may iustly admire the Sauciness of some half Atheistical Spirits, who find themselves puzzled in the search of the most obuious things in nature (none of them can say how, or by what, one poore flies wing is knit together) yet will forsooth, haue God to giue Euidence of his own deep Secrets (the greatest Mysteries of grace) or Cannot belieue. Experience teaches, how prompt and ready euery good Subiect is to obey his Prince, at the least beck, signe, or insinuation of his will, Though the Intimation carries not with it strick euidence, yet in this matter of mans Submission to God, when both his glory and our eternal Welfare are Concerned, innumerable stand howering and doubtful; Questioning whether God requires firm Faith from them, And why? Because an Euidence suitable to their fancy seem's wanting.

*The persistence of Atheistical Spirits.*

7. Humour once such à Curiosity or giue them à greater light of Euidence, the next thing required will be, that God interiously teach all by Himselfe, without Church, Pastors, Doctors, or any. And if this serues not the turn, He must either please to open the Heauens at à call, and (once à year at least) visibly instruct them, or there is no drawing such Spirits, out of à state of Incredulity. I Say contrary, the Euidence of Credibility appatent in those manifest Signs and marks which illustrate true Christianity (à great mercy of God he giues so much of it) is abundantly sufficient to induce the most obdurate heart in the world to belieue with such an Assent as suites God's great Maiesty, that is, with à Faith most firm and Infalible. Obserue an vdeniable Euidence.

*Euidence of Credibility enough.*

*The Appearance and Credibility of true Christianity.*

8. It is euident That euer since the first Plantation of Christianity, there has been à Continued Succession of Pastors and Doctors, who taught the Belief of one God and one Saviour Iesus Christ, with other Articles of the Catholick Faith. It is Euident, that innumerable Professors of this one belief, haue been eminent in Learning, wisdom, Sanctity of life, and Contempt of the world. It is Euident, that the Predictions of Prophets

phers uttered whole Ages before our Saviour preached, agree only to one Christian Society known the whole world over. The Vniuersal extent of this great Moral Body is euident. Vnity in Doctrin, Euident. Admirable Conuerfions wrought by this Church, are euident. Vndeniable and most glorious Miracles, Euident. The Courage, the Constancy, the profound Humility of Martyrs, and finally their bloodshedding, the last Testimony of loyalty (Authors worthy of credit number them 10 eleven Millions) are Euident. Here in few words, you haue before you no *Romance*, no *Furb*, no *fraud*, but most clear and indisputable Euidence. Now ponder first but seriously, And Ask whether God, after the sight of so many illustrious Marks. Manifested to all, could permit, those Millions and Millions who loued truth, and heartily sought to serue no other, but the great God of truth To be deluded, with meer Phanfies and fooleries? Were this possible, might we not all, charge plain Coufenance vpon an Infinite Goodnes, and most iustly complain: *Si error est quem Credidimus &c.* If we belieue an error, it is you great Soueraign, that has deceiued vs.

9. In the next place cast your thoughts and seriously also, vpon all Sectaries past and present since Christianity began. You will find (and here likewise we plead by Euidence) no Succession of Pastors lawfully sent to preach, no Conuerfions of Nations wrought by any. No eminent Sanctity, no Vniuersal extent of their Religion, no Vnity in Doctrin, and which utterly ruin's their Cause, nothing like à Miracle among them. How then dare these Nouellists destitute of all outward appearances of Truth, or any thing like Euidence, goe about to make their Religion credible by meer toyes and trifles? These I call trifles. Here to snarle at à Pope, there at abuses in the Church. Now to fill Volumes with Criticisms, now to patch together à few broken Sentences of the ancient Fathers; That is in à word, to be euerlastingly quarrelling, and neuer to Propose so much as à probable Way how quarrel's may be ended. Can such trifles I Say (and here in brief you haue the utmost

*The Euidence, indisputable.*

*The impossibility of deception in this Euidence*

*Sectaries utterly destitute of all Euidence of Credibility.*

*Sectaries new way of Arguing.*



374 Disc. 3. C. 10. *The Resolution of Faith.*

Sectaries can doe) extinguish the light, the Lustre, and Evident Credibility of God's own manifested Oracle? Let common reason Iudge in this case. Now wee goe on in the Analysis.

*This evidence explained, the Analysis, goes on clearly.*

10. Having Said already, We believe because God has revealed the Incarnation, (the like is of any other Mystery) and being impossibilitated (if we stand within the *formal Terms* of Faith) to allege any further intellectual Motiue of believing than this; The last of all. *God has revealed, what I Assent to.* It necessarily followes, that euery other Question relating to the *Formal object of Faith ceases here.* But if it be demanded, how the Vnderstanding dares rest most firmly on an Object not evidently seen, wee passe from that Power (without breaking off the Analysis) to the *Will* and Say, she can by her pious Affection command the intellectual Faculty to *Capture* it selfe, in *Obsequium fidei*, and believe most vndoubtedly.

*The Power of the will Over the Vnderstanding. Manifest impiety not to believe.*

11. Now if another Question ensue's. How the Will can bring the Intellect to so much Obsequiousness? The Answer is at hand. It doth so, because God has shewed by all those most prudent and manifest Signes already laid forth to Reason, that He is the Author of the Doctrin we believe: In so much, that it is not only the highest imprudence imaginable to disbelieve, but Wickednes to do so, in a matter of such Consequence. *I say Wickednes*, for after a full sight had of the rational Motiues inducing to Faith (seeing none can arrive to Evidence of the Mysteries) One of these three wayes must be followed. *To believe nothing. To believe meer Fooleries: Or finally to believe a Doctrin which God has distinguished by Evident Marks and Signatures*, from Heresy and falshood. To believe nothing either is, or tend's to Atheism, and that's Wickedness. To believe Fooleries, no wise man will hear of. Therefore all are bound to believe, and if so; Faith must bee Evidently prudent and rational, I mean so manifested by supernatural Wonders, that reason is proued vnreasonable in case it denies Assent. Now I Subsume. But these Supernatural Signes, One only Society of Christians Evidences, and it is no other but the

*What reason forces vpon Every one.*

Roman

Roman  
which  
Doctr  
12.  
to po  
make  
therw  
ten th  
singe  
are)  
13.  
reflec  
them  
Roman  
any th  
the V  
I need  
strabl  
Scorr  
Signe  
neue  
lustr  
Anci  
brief  
most  
be.  
14.  
restitu  
Chur  
and  
learn  
any  
Eccl  
And  
wher

### Disc. 3. C. 10. *The Resolution of Faith.* 575

Roman Catholick Church, Therefore she only proposes Faith which is rational, and consequently obliges all to believe her Doctrin.

12. Hence you see that every one in the Choise of Religion, is to ponder in the first place, those weighty Arguments which make an Election prudent: And then it is prudent (not otherwise) when Signes from Heaüen Gods own Marks, heighten the Religions Credibility so far above all other false and forged Sects, That these at the first full Sight, appear (as they are) horrid, gastly, and contemptible.

13. If you will Discover more clearly, what I would haue reflected on in this Particular. Be pleased to compare *Heathenism, Iudaism, Turcism*, and finally *heresy* with one glorious *Roman Catholick Church*. Speak plainly; Can you find in these any thing like the Miracles, the Conuerfions, the large Extent, the Vnity and Sanctity of this one most Euidenced Oracle? I need not proue the Negatiue (*You cannot*) for its Demonstrable to sense. Heathenism and Heresy, are now things of Scorn the whole world ouer, *Iudaism*, 'tis true once had its Signes and Miracles, wherein it far surpassed Heresy (which neuer had, nor will haue any like it). Howouer, Christ's Illustrious Kingdom, his Church Militant, vastly surmount's that Ancient and now decayed Lustre of *Iudaism*. And thus much briefly of the Euidence of Credibility, which once had, Faith most firm easily followes, and without it, none can believe.

14. A second Proposition. *Faith in this present State is resolu'd into the Authority of God, the first Verity speaking by the Church.* This way of resoluing Faith is both plain and easy, and very suitable to the common Apprehension of every one, learned and vnlearned, who if Questioned, why they believe my Diuine Mystery, readily Answer. *Sic docet Sancta mater Ecclesia.* So our Holy Mother the Catholick Church teaches. And they Answer well, For the First Instrumental Principle where into Faith is resolu'd, must be so clear and Conspicuous

*One only Society Proposeth Faith which is rational.*

*What makes an Election Prudent?*

*No Society Comparable to the Roman Catholick Church, in this rational Euidence.*

*The Plainest resolution of Faith.*

576 Disc. 3. C. 10. *The Resolution of Faith.*

spicuous à Rule, that all may easily learn the Doctrin delivered by it.

*The Assertion  
Promoted  
by Scripture.*

*Sectaries  
endles La-  
bour.*

15. The Assertion is plainly laid forth. *Deut. 30. V. 11. The Commandment I command thee day is not above thee, nor far off, nor situated in Heauen that thou may'st Say: Who of vs is able to ascend into Heauen to bring it to vs? That is. To know where true Faith is taught, we need not to weary our selues with much Speculation, or expect that God in Heauen, lay open the sense of Scripture by Enthusiasmis or any Priuate Reuelation. Nor placed beyond the Sea that thou may'st pretend: Which of vs can passe ouer the sea and bring it to vs. And hereby That endless Labour, that euerlasting Inquisition made after Truth, proper to Sectaries, seem's rejected. Originals must be examined, Passages of Scripture compared, History sought into, Libraries turned ouer, Languages learned, Yea, and the very particular Mysteries of Diuine Faith, must be weighed by humane Reason (and thus they descend into the Abyſs of God's secrets) before they come to Satisfaction in Religion. All is toylsome, all dissatisfactory, all endless. A more short and easy way is at hand, For faith the Scripture. *Iuxta est sermo valde*, in *ut tuo*. The Word is very neere thee, in thy Mouth and in thy Heart to doe it. And the Apostle. *Rom. 10. 8.* Applies this very Passage to the Word of our Christian Faith. Hence I argue.*

*The Church,  
is the first  
Instrumental  
Principle.*

16. But the Church is that first Instrumental Principle, and most easy Rule which teaches our Christian Verities, Scripture teaches them not so plainly, Therefore Faith may well bee resolued into the first Verity speaking by the Church and whoeuer resolues it without all dependance of this liuing Oracle, put's the Conclusion before the Premises, as we shall see afterward.

17. I proue the first part of my Assertion. 1. It is as evidently credible that God speak's to all by the Church, as that he anciently spake by the Prophets and Apostles, For we haue the

### Disc. 3. C. 10. *The Resolution of Faith.* 579

the same supernatural Signs manifested in all these Oracles à  
like, as is largely shown above, and Consequently haue with  
them the same Grounds of an Euident Credibility, But  
Euident Credibility; induced the Faithful to belieue those mani-  
fested Prophets and Apostles, *Ergo*, the Churches Euident Cre-  
dibility, euery way Parallel, induces all in this present State to be-  
lieue this Oracle. 2. God is equally infallible, Yea one and the  
same Verity, whether He speak's by one single Person or many,  
and must be heard with all profound Submission, Provided,  
that the Oracle He speak's by, bee made immediatly Credible  
by the lustre of Supernatural wonders, as most euidently the  
Church is. 3. The Church, Answerable to the Prophets and  
Apostles, is à Liuing Oracle, and vpon that Account able to Solue  
all doubts which may occur in controuerted Matters, but the  
Clarity of à liuing euenced Oracle, ready to decide all such  
difficulties, makes the Rule of Faith easy, and much auail's to  
à clear Resolution. 4. Our Analysis into God's Veracity Spea-  
king by the Church, Stand's firm vpon that *first Principal* and In-  
fallible Motiue, the *Diuine Testimony it Selfe*, I call it *Principal* be-  
cause the Church is only Instrumental as we now said, whereby  
God speak's: And this Resolution is made without any danger  
of à Process in *Infinisum*, or the least Shadow of à vicious Cir-  
cle, as Shall presently appear by giuing the last Analysis.

*The Church  
shewes Euident  
Credibility.  
Parallel with  
that of the  
Apostles.*

*A second  
reason*

*A third, and*

*fourth rea-  
son*

*The other  
part of the  
Assertion is  
manifest.*

18. In the Interim, know thus much. To proue the second  
part of our Assertion. viz. That Scripture is not à Rule so  
perspicuous and clear in deliuering the very Chiefe Articles of  
Faith, as the Church is in controuerted Matters, were to proue  
à plain Euidence, For what can be more manifest, then that  
wee, and all Hereticks pas't and present, are at endless debates  
concerning the true Sense and meaning of those very words  
we read in Scripture? Yet the Rule of Faith (Sectaries confess  
it) ought to bee clear open and manifest to all. I waue all fur-  
ther discourse vpon this Subiect, and here adioyn our last Analy-  
sis.

19. One demand's, why I belieue that great Mystery of the  
D d d d Incar-

578 Disc. 3. C. 10. *The Resolution of Faith.*

*The last  
Resolution  
given.*

*All De-  
mands  
answered.*

*Our resolu-  
tion is the same  
with that of  
the Primiti-  
ve Chri-  
stians.*

*The Motives  
alike.*

*Why we be-  
lieve? And  
how we  
prove by  
rational  
Motives*

Incarnation? I may well Answer first, God's own sacred Word, which we call Scripture Asserts it. The next Question will be, Why I believe this to be Scripture? I answer. The same God speaking by his own Oracle, the Church, affirm's it. A third Question followes. Why doe I believe that God speak's thus by the Church? I Answer the Ground of my Faith in this particular, is *God's own speaking* and the very same with that hee spake by the Apostles. As therefore his Own word, vttered by those first great Masters, vpheld the Primitiue Faith, without any further ground, or Proceſs in *Infinisum*, So his own Speaking by this Oracle of the Church, vphold's mine. And I can go no further; For the last formal Obiect of Faith, has none latter, That One word of Truth is enough to believe vpon. Again, as those first pious Christians, had any moued a doubt concerning their Inducements to Faith, would haue answered. *The blind see. The lame walk, strange Miracles are wrought by these blessed men*, And therefore we both must in Prudence, and will believe that God speak's by them; So I likewise bring to light the same Signal Motiues Euident in the Church, and Say, I both *must*, if prudence guides me, and *Will* believe that God speak's by this Oracle, known as well by Her Miracles and supernatural Signatures, as euer any Apostle was known.

20. And thus you see first, as I noted aboue, How we passe from the *Formal Obiect* of Faith (*God's own Testimony proposed by the Church*) to the Prudent Inducements of believing, where-vpon the Iudgement of Credibility (not Faith it selfe) is vltimately grounded. Now these Inducements being laid forth to reason, The Will command's an absolute Assent, which rest's vpon *God's word*, spoken by this Oracle. You see. 2. All danger of a vicious Circle auoyded in this way of resolving Faith. For when I believe that God speak's by the Church, I resolve not the Belief of that Truth, into another antecedent Reuelation taken from Scripture, yet wholly obscure, and no way so immediatly Credible as the Church is, (for if I did so, a Proceſs in *Infinisum* would necessarily follow) But I believe that word of

Truth

### Disc. 3. C. 10. *The Resolution of Faith.* 579

Truth for it selfe immediatly, and rest there, As the ancient Christians relyed vpon the very words spoken by the Apostles, without recurring to any former, or surer Reuelation. If therefore those happy Belieuers made no vicious Circle in their Faith (hauing no two Propositions prouing one another to make à Circle of) We in our belief are altogether as free, from that Entry Circular way, in our Resolution. It is true, All of vs, if Questioned about the Euidence of Credibility, most bring to light Motiues inducing to Faith, *They theirs; We ours;* both are à like significant, both Supernatural, as is already explained.

21. You may gather. 3. out of what is here and formerly noted, how ealy it is after à full Sight had of those signal Motiues (and they more set forth the Churches Glory, than any Traine of attendants can illustrate the greatest Monarch) That the first connatural Language which God speaks by the Church, is this general Truth. *There only his Special Providence Directs and govern's, where the illustrious Signes of his own Soueraignty manifest,* That he teaches by à Voice peculiar to Himselfe. But these Signes most euidently, are seen in one only Society of Christians, the Roman Catholick Church, Therefore he teaches by this One only Oracle, And the necessary Lesson he will haue all to learn is; *That he has called all to one Communion of Faith in one Church,* Euidenced by Supernatural wonders. This fundamental Verity we belieue, And it is the first Act of faith we elicit, Or; that Primigenial Assent which connaturally arises from God's own voice deliuered to vs by this Oracle, without depending on Scripture, if we make à right Analytis. This General truth once established, and none can rationally contradict it; We now proceed to solue à few Obiections.

*The word of truth belimed for is Selfe*

*The primitive Motiues, and ours, the same,*

*The illustrious Signs apparent in the Church,*

*are God's own Voice.*

*what we learn by them.*



## CHAP. XI.

*Sectaries Obiections solved. The fallible Agreement of all  
Concerning the Canon of Scripture, no Proof at all.  
No vniuersal Consent for the Sectaries Scripture, or  
the Sense of it. How the Church is both the Ve-  
rity believed, and the Motiue, why we believe.  
Other Difficulties Examined.*

*Sectaries  
Obiections  
only, answer-  
red*

1. **I** Speak here of Sectaries Obiections, knowing well, some Diuines who make the Churches Proposition most infallible (and herein all Catholicks agree) yet hold it insufficient to be the last Principle, Whereinto Faith is resolu'd: For say these, it is only à necessary Condition by virtue whereof the ancient Reuelation is infallibly applied to vs. In this Strife (purely Theological, and some what as, I thinke, *de Nomine*) I shall not long busy my Selfe, being chiefly to attend to what Sectaries do, or can propose against our Doctrin.

*why Secta-  
ries cannot  
resolue their  
Faith into  
Scriptures*

*As Catho-  
licks Doe  
into the  
Church &*

2. The first Obiection. If the Catholick after à prudent Consideration had of the known Motiues already specified, can belieue what euer the Church reaches, and Consequently resolu-ue his faith into the Authority of God speaking by that Oracle: Why may not the Sectary as well vpon this one Iudgement. viz. All acknowledge Scripture to bee God's word, as easily belieue, and resoluue his faith into pure Scripture, independently of Church Authority? Answ. Such à Beliefe and Resolution is impossible, because as we said aboue, none can in this present State assent to this generall Truth. Scripture is God's Word, or belieue so much as any Verity in it, if the Authority of an  
Infallible

Infalible Church be reiected. To the pretended ground taken from the Consent of all Christians owning Scripture for God's word, I haue partly answered. That consent *alone* induces not any to belieue one reuealed Article by an Infalible act of Faith, if those whole Consenting multitudes, be all supposed fallible. First, euery one knowes, the multitudes of Turks agree thus far, that their Alcoran is God's word, yet such an agreement though very Vniuersal, induces no wise man to belieue any Divinity in the Book, or to own its Doctrin as Diuine, and sacred.

2. And this reason hinted at aboue is, more à *Priori*.

3. The Agreement of all Christians, is truly an effect of Faith, or rather of the Obiects Credibility antecedently presupposed Credible vpon other grounds, before men agreed so vniuersally in that Christian truth: For this Causal is good, *Therefore Christians agreed in that Truth, because it was previously made Credible vpon other sound Motiues*: And not the contrary. It is credible, *because all conspired in à Consent so vniuersal*. Wherefore, if very many, who now own Scripture to be Diuine, should leaue off to iudge So, and reiect the Book or any Part in it as fabulous, That would not diminish its ancient Credibility; And no more, Say I, would the Addition of any new Consenters, who now reiect it (should, they agree with vs) highten one whit our Beliefe, or make the Truth we Assent to more Credible, than it was before. And this proues, That the *Original Credibility* of Scripture is not grounded vpon any vniuersal fallible Consent; but stand's firm vpon other stronger antecedent Motiues. Nay it cannot Originally depend therevpon, Seing that Consent is an Effect of those other preuius Motiues, as S. Austin often cited, fully and most amply declares. Be it how will.

4. The greatest Difficulty yet remain's, for if we enquire of Sectaries, where we may find this common Consent, we haue but à very slippery Foundation to stand vpon? Because not only Heretiques of old, denied the greatest part of Scripture, But, to come to these neerer times, the *Machianellians* and *Socinians*

*The agreement of all, Concerning Scripture is an effect,*

*Not the Original Proof of the Scriptures Credibility.*

*The Sectaries Plea taken from any vniuersal, fallible Consent, is groundles.*

*whole Multitudes against Sectaries.* *simians* also called Christians, hold many things in that Sacred Book so far aboue all humane reach, that they Say, it is vnworthy God to require from any à firm beliefe of them. Add herevnto the multitudes of Heathens, Iewes and Turks, who incomparably surpass Christians in number; All these, you know, Vnanimously reiect our Scriptures. How then can the far lesser number of Witnesses agreeing in one consent Plead so much as probably against such multitudes of Opponents, If no other motiue be alleged in behalfe of the Scriptures Credibility, but only the Consent of few, against many.

*Sectaries plainly Conuincid.* 5. But to silence all Sectaries hereafter, Who insist so much vpon this vniuersal Consent, we will here *gratin* suppose the Argument drawn from thence to be most conuincing, Yet withall Assert, it so little aduantages the pretences of Protestants, That it vtterly ruin's their vndefensible Cause. For where haue these men, any vniuersal Agreement of Christians for their Canon of Scripture? Where haue they it in behalfe of their iarring Opinions? Where for their Negatiue Articles? Where for their particular Sense of Scripture, which not only the Roman Catholick Church, but others also reiect as false, vngrounded, and Heretical. If therefore this Common consent for the Bible were more Vniuersal then it is, it help's not Sectaries, whilst their singular Opinions, their Canon aud Sense, And in à word their whole Religion (as Protestancy) is so particular to Them selues, That the rest of Christians, ashamed to own it, will be no Partners with them.

*Obserues the Proofs.* 6. And thus you see, where the Weaknes of this whole Plea lies. They will haue à vniuersal Consent for the bare letter of Scripture; Let that be so. Its nothing to the purpose, if afterward, without any thing like à Vniuersal agreement they misinterpret the Book, and make it speak what God neuer meant. *The Book of Scripture misinterpreted Promes nothing.* But this is done, and I proue it vpon an vdeniable ground thus. Whilst these men cannot name, or Design à Church reputed Orthodox siue or six Ages since, which as vniuersally maintained their new Doctrin, as She then owned the old letter of the

of the Bible, They misinterpret the Book, And gain no more by saying that vniuersal Consent for the meer letter, then the Arians, or worst of Heretiques gain. But to name such a Church for their Nouelties is imposible, and consequently no less imposible, to resoluue one Article of Protestancy into God's Diuine Testimony, expressed in Scripture.

7. A 2. Obiection. Christians faith seem's not resoluable into the Diuine Testimony speaking by the Church, because the Church is *Res credita*, or, the *Material Obiect* belieued, Witness that Article of our Creed. I belieue the Holy Catholick Church. Therefore it cannot be *Ratio Credendi*, or the *Formal Obiect*, which moues to belieue. I Answer first. Sectaries must solve this Difficulty, For is not the very Doctrin contained in Scripture according to them, the *Res Credita*, or the *Material Obiect* belieued. The *Incarnation* I hope, whereof we read in Scripture (the like may be said of euery other Mystery) is the Truth belieued with such a faith as they haue. And the very same Word of God, wherein these Truths are contained, is also the *Ratio Credendi*, or *Formal Obiect* mouing to belieue. For demand why they Assent to the Incarnation? Tis Answered, because God has reuealed it in Scripture. No other Motiue can be pretended. Therefore the same Scripture, differently considered, is both the *Material Obiect*, or *Truy* belieued, and likewise the *Formal*, which moues to belieue. And thus we Say, The Churches Proposition, Or rather God speaking by the Church, may well be the Truth belieued, and a Motiue also why we belieue, wherein there is no Difficulty at all. Take here one Instance in known Philosophy which teaches, that light both terminates our Vision, and so considered, is the *Material Obiect seen*; withall, it moues the Power to see it, and vpon that Account; is rightly called the *Formal Obiect*. In Acts of Faith you haue the like Instance. For example. When the Iewes Assented to the ancient Prophets, vttering these words. *Hec dicit Dominus &c.* *Our Lord speak's thus.* They belieued that God spake by the mouth

But Sectaries do so, and tis proved.

How the Church is both the Truth belied, and, And the Motiue also why we belieue.

Sectaries must solve this difficulty

By two Instances we see, what is asserted.

mouth of those Prophets (it was one of the Material obiects Assented to by Faith) and they believed also for those Prophets words (as God's own Voice) and had respect to them, as to à Formal obiect, *Why they believed.*

*How, and in  
what Order  
we believe  
the truths  
Proposed by  
the Church?*

*This general  
Assent first  
precedes.*

*Afterward  
we descend  
to other par-  
ticulars.*

8. A 3. Obiection. If the Church be the *Primum Credibile*, or the first *Believable Oracle*, whereby God speak's to all in this present State, We are to declare, how and in what order, those Truths are deliuered by it, which all are obliged to believe: And this cannot be done without Confusion, and perhaps danger of à Circle also. We haue partly Answered above, where it is said, That as the Apostles after the Knowledge had of our Sauours Miracles, believed first in à *General Way*, *He was the true Messias*; So we, in this present State, induced by all the Motiues of Credibility already laid forth, believe first in General, That this Manifested Oracle is Christs own Spouse, which infallibly teaches the right way to Saluation. And this truth we Assent to immediatly vpon the Churches Proposition, or rather vpon God's Testimony speaking by the Church, without depending on Scripture; Iust as the Apostles believed Christ our Lord to be the true Messias, vpon his own Testimony proued Credible by Miracles, and other Signal Wonders. Thus far there is no Confusion at all, nor any danger of à vicious Circle. Now further. This General truth admitted, we proceed to the Beliefe of other particular Verities proposed, and herein also follow the Apostles Steps and practise, who assented to euery single Article which our Sauour deliuered afterward, vpon his own Word. Why therefore may not we also believe euery particular Article proposed by the Church, speaking in the name of God, If (which is already proued) the same God deliuers Truth as well by this Oracle, as he did anciently by the Prophets and Apostles. No disparity can be giuen.

9. Hence I Say, whoeuer will make à full Proposition of Diuine Faith, and giue à Satisfactory Resolution thereof, must both Propose and Resolue it into God's Authority speaking by

by this one *Signalized and evidenced Oracle*. And here in few words is the vltimate reason of our Assertion. If we exclude the infallible Authority of an evidenced Church, neither the Canon of Scripture, nor any verity in it, nor its true sense, which Heretiques deprave, can be admitted as Gods infallible word. Therefore S. Austin Spake most profoundly, where He professes: *He would not believe the Gospel without Church Authority*. Hence it followes, That though one might believe the Mystery of the Trinity, or the Incarnation, for the truths revealed in Scripture, yet if a further Question be moued concerning the Authenticalness of these very Scriptural Expressions, All, if they will finally resolute their Faith, must rely on Gods Testimony speaking by the Church, and believe that very Doctrine to be Diuine, because She own's it as Diuine.

*The reason why faith must be resolved, into Gods Testimony speaking by the Church.*

20. Thus we said. Chap. 20. n. 11. That the infallible Authority of the present Church consummates the ancient Revelation, which long since past and remote from vs., cannot moue to believe, vnlesse Her Testimony conueys it to vs, and in this sense compleat's it; And what way of believing or resolving Faith can be more easy, then to Say. I believe the Incarnation, both because S. Iohn wrote it, and because God speaking by the Church, saith he wrote it. These two *Indivisibly* taken may as well make vp one total Motiue of believing, as the Royal Prophets Testimony, and S. Peters infallible declaration added to it. *Act. 2. V. 25.* became one entire total Motiue to those first believing Christians. I say *Indivisibly*; And therefore the Churches Testimony concurs not merely as an extrinsecal condition preuiously assented to, but jointly terminates Faith together with the ancient Revelation, as shall be Presently declared. Herein also there is nothing like confusion, but the greatest Clarity, free from all danger of any vicious Circle.

*This way of believing most easy.*

*The Churches Testimony not merely a Condition.*

11. A. 4. Obiection. The Motiues inducing to believe that God speak's by the Church, or that all are called to seek their Saluation in this one Euidenced Oracle, are Church De-  
Eccc  
Arins.



*How the Motives induce to believe*

*Are Dissents of the Church also.*

*In what sense Scripture was Compleat to the Primitive believers.*

*Why not so now to vs, without Church authority?*

*Strins.* For we all believe that the true Spouse of Christ is Holy, united in Faith, universally spread the whole World over &c. Therefore they can no more rationally induce to believe, that first necessary Truth. Viz. All are called to one Communion of Faith, Than one Article of faith obscure in it selfe, rationally induce to believe another, wholly as obscure. We have Answered above. These Motives may be considered two ways. First, as they are evidently perceptible by sense, and so naturally they precede Faith, and induce to believe. 2. As attested vpon Gods own Authority speaking by the Church, And in this Sense they precede not Faith, but are Articles believed, wherein there is no Mystery at all, if, which is certain, The same thing can be both known and believed by different Assents, vpon distinct Motives.

As 5. Obiection. Scripture when newly written, and proposed by the Euangelists or Apostles to the Primitive Christians, was to them so total, and compleat à Formal Object to ground faith vpon, that they needed no Authority of the Church to compleat it more, Therefore it's still à full and perfect Motive of believing, in order to all this very Age, independently of Church Authority. The Obiection brings with it its own Solution, For if those Holy Writers of Scripture were Infallible (whereof no man doubt's) and proposed all they wrote as Gods Diuine word, That very Proposition was fully as certain to them, as any Church Authority, whether past or present, can be to vs. Hence I say, though Scripture was then (That infallible Publication supposed) à full and compleat Motive to ground faith vpon, yet now it Cannot be so *Quod nos*, or in order to Believers in this present State, without more, not because there is any want in Scripture, considered in it self, But vpon another account that Circumstances are very different, and notably changed since those first dayes, For now we haue neither Apostle nor Prophet at hand, to Testify or publish the Scriptures Diuinity; The ancient signes of Credibility which adorned those first blessed men, and made Scripture

ture most acceptable, are out of our sight, Therefore God's Church succeed's with her Lustre, and Supplies, as it were that want, or takes the place of those deceased Prophets and Apostles.

13. By what is here Said, you may easily vnderstand the sense of those two Terms, *Quoad se*, and *Quoad nos* frequently used in this matter, though not free from Sectaries Caviils, Who say; Whatever is *Quoad se*, considered in it selfe à Formal Object, must be so in order to others, because it is à Relative, and cannot but haue respect to our vnderstanding. Answer. All this is true, after à full and infallible Proposition made of the Object; Otherwise most certainly à Reuelation may be in it selfe both Diuine and infallible, though it appears not so to all, for want of à due application to Believers. Again, It may be in some Circumstances à compleat Motiue to ground faith vpon, and in another State cease to be so. Many Verities in Scripture, when first written and proposed by Apostolical men, were compleat Objects of faith to the Primitiue Christians, yet are not by virtue of that Proposition now, so to vs, Because They neither write in this State, nor immediatly Propose the truths contained in Scripture. Hence it is, that the Church, as wee said, Supplies that defect, and compleat's by her Proposition those ancient Reuelations, which issued from Christ and his Apostles. And for this reason Her Testimony, *Quoad nos*, is more clear, more known, and more immediatly Credible, than Scripture can be.

14. 3. Difficulties may arise concerning the Scriptures Canon, and sense also, which none can decide but the Church only, and vpon that Account, Shee is more Credible and more immediatly known to vs, than the Scriptures abstruse Sense, which is very often remote from vs, before God speaking by this Oracle, laies the truth open in clearer Terms. And what wonder is here? Whilst Sectaries confesse, (to vnderstand the true sense of God's word in matters most Fundamental) other

Eccc 2

Rules

*Two Terms, explained.*

*A Reuelation may be in it selfe Diuine.*

*Though it appears not so to all.*

*The Churches Testimony Clear.*

*And necessary for other Reasons.*

## 588 Disc. 3. C. 12. *How the Churches Testimony*

*what Se-  
ries at-  
tending.*

Rules and means must be used. The Original Languages are to be examined, several Passages compared together, daily Reading and pondering the different places with much Prayer also, seem necessary. What is this to Say, but that their *reading, pondering, and comparing*, are in order to them, means and Rules more immediatly known, then the hidden Sense of Scripture? Herein then lies the difference, that we in *Lieu* of their fallible reading recur to an Infallible Church, and Say her Testimony is more perspicuous, easy, and clear to vs, than the dark Verities in Scripture are to them, after all their pondering and comparing.

## CHAP. XII.

*The last Obiection Proposed: Whether the Churches  
Testimony may be called the Formal Object  
of Faith. Other Notes and Conside-  
rations, Concerning The Resolu-  
tion of Faith.*

*God has  
spoken the  
Same Verity  
by different  
Oracles.*

1. **A** 6.<sup>th</sup> Obiection. If God, (whereof no man doubt's) once said in Scripture. *The Word was made flesh*, its needless to speak the same Truth again by the Church, Nay, this seem's impossible, vnless the Churches Testimony be properly the *Formal Object of Faith*. Answ. The first part of the Obiection contains no difficulty, for it is certain God has spoken the same Verities by distinct and different Oracles, by different Euangelists, for example. And why cannot he as well speak them again, by an Euangelist and the Church? If the Church be absolutely infallible, for the Diuersity of the Organs or Oracles He speak's by, diuersifies not at all his Sacred word.

2. Now

2. Now to what is hinted at concerning the formal Object. I Ask, whether this Assertion in Catholick Principles be not de-  
*side*, and revealed by Almighty God? Every Doctrine proposed by  
*the Church is true.* The Catholick Answer's affirmatiuely, And  
 here is one Verity, as an Instance for many. *The Church is infal-*  
*lible, or cannot err.* I Ask again, whether this very Proposition  
 made by the Church, may not be believed vpon Her own Au-  
 thority, by an Act of Diuine Faith? Some Diuines Answer ne-  
 gatiuely, and Discourle thus. The Assent giuen to the Autho-  
 rity or Proposition of the Church is not Faith, but rather an ex-  
 trinsecal disposition to Faith; So that by one Assent we first Say,  
 The Churches Proposition is infallible, and afterward by a true  
 Act of Faith, believe the Truth proposed by Her, vpon God's  
 pure Reuelation contained in Scripture, or vpon Apostolical Tradi-  
 tion.

*A question  
proposed.*

*What some  
Diuines  
answer.*

3. Though this Discourse, which defend's the Churches  
 absolute Infallibility, giues no advantage to Sectaries, yet it seem's  
 difficult for two reasons chiefly. First, if a firm and infallible  
 Iudgement terminated vpon the Churches neuer erring Proposi-  
 tion, which fully declares Christ real Presence in the Eucharist,  
 for example, Precedes the true belief of that Mystery grounded  
 on Scripture, or Apostolical Tradition, That very faith as grounded on  
 Scripture, would be a necessary obscure act generated by the Dis-  
 course, or ineuitably inferred from the Connexion between the  
 Churches infallible Proposition (not assented to by Faith) and the  
 Diuine Reuelation in Scripture. The Inference is clear. For the  
 Church Saies infallibly, *Christ is really present*, And I Assent to that  
 Truth, but by no Act of Faith (say these) Yet from thence I eu-  
 idently inferr. That He is really present, and this is done befo-  
 re I believe the Verity by Supernatural Faith. I think this cannot  
 be granted. Some Answer that preuius Iudgement is only a  
 condition disposing to believe, and not the Cause or Motiue why  
 I believe. *Contra.* Call it cause; call it condition or what you  
 please, by virtue of that Iudgement, I Assent to the truth of the  
 Mystery in it selfe, and from thence must necessarily infer that

*Their An-  
swer  
seem's  
difficult.*

*What is  
necessarily  
inferred  
vpon that  
Iudgements.*

290 [I. 3. C. 12. *How the Churches Testimony*

God has revealed it, before I believe it by supernatural Faith. And this is to Discourse, not from the *formal* Object of Faith to the *material* (which may be probably defended) but from one Principle purely *extrinsecal* to Faith. viz. The Churches Proposition *obscurely known*, to the Divine Testimony and the matter *revelated*.

The Church  
immediately  
Credible.

4. A second Reason. God truly speak's by the Church which is as well known by its own lustre and Miracles to be à Divine Oracle, as euer Prophet or Apostle were known to be so, by their Signatures and Miracles. No Disparity can be giten. But these Prophets and Apostles were made by their Marks and Wonders, immediately Credible, therefore the Church hold's Parallel, and is also by *it self* and for *it self* immediately credible. And hence it followes, That the Churches Infallibility may, and must in à General way be believed, before we come to an infallible Belief of Scripture. For to Say, I must first believe by true Faith the Churches Infallibility vpon Scripture, And to Say again, I cannot first believe that very Scripture to be Divine or to speak truth, But vpon the Churches Testimony, seem's, if not impossible, at least à very implex, intricate and à difficult way of Believing. I say *first believe*, For none in this present state can know the Scriptures Diuinity, without Church Authority.

This way  
of believing,  
implex and  
intricate,

The Church  
can ground  
an act of  
Divine  
Faith.

Divines  
teach so.

5. For these and many other Reasons I Conclude, that this Proposition made by the Church. *She is an Oracle teaching all truth whereby men may attain Salvation*, is à sufficient Motiue to ground an Act of Divine Faith vpon? The learned Suarez, to omit many other Diuines. Disp. 9. de Fide. Sect. 9. n. 14. Speak's most profoundly, and pertinently to my purpose. *Ista Ecclesia seipsum proponit: ut veram, & quia &c.* The Church proposes Herselfe as true, and because she is sufficiently and evidently proposed, therefore she obliges all to believe such à Verity, no less then other things appertaining to Faith: Iust after that manner, as à true Prophet who sufficiently proposes truths revealed to him by God, Consequently, sufficiently proposes himselfe to be à true Prophet. Moreouer. Disp. 3. de Fide. Sect. 11. n. 11. *Quod Ecclesia definit, Deus per Ecclesiam testificatur.*

VVbat

*scripture  
accord's*

*Ancient Fa-  
thers Speak  
most signi-  
ficantly.*

*Reason also  
proves the  
Assertion.*

When the Church Defines, God testifies the same Verity by the Church. Scripture is Consonant where the Church is called the Pillar and ground of truth. The Fathers accord so vniuersally that à Volume would not set forth their expressions. Take only these two in place of many. S. Cyril. in Conc. Ephes. Tom. 1. de Nicanu Patrium. They (the Fathers there) were inspired by the Holy Ghost not to recede from Truth. Non enim in se loquebantur &c. For they spake not (but Christ our Sauieur Witnessing) it was the Spirit of God and the Eternal Father that spake in them. S. Greg. Lib. 1. Regist. Epist. 24. Is yet more significant, where he professes no less Reuerence to the four General Councils, then to the four Euangelists.

6. Whoouer read's these and the like Authorities cannot but Say, the Voice of the Church as it Proceeds from that Oracle, is the Voice of God; And therefore Diuine, certain, and infallible, Or contrarywise must grant, it's only Humane, fallible, and may err. Speake so: And it followes first, that if the whole Church should err in the most essential Points of Faith, God would not be yet Said to deceiue any, because his increated Authority Speaks not by it; nor is engaged to rescue this his own Spouse from errour. It followes. 2. If any one denied, either Purgatory, or Transubstantiation explicitly defined by the Church, and not so clearly expressed in Scripture, He would not be guilty of Heresy, though he peruersely refused to belieue these Articles, pressely upon this account, That the Church Defines them. The Inference is clear, for in doing so, He denies not Gods Reuelation, because the Churches Definitions (nor Diuine Testimony) are in à lower rank, and much inferiour to all, that God has spoken. It followes. 3. We belieue the Churches Definitions by à very different infused Habit from that, whereby we Assent to the Truths reuealed in Scripture, and to find such à supernatural and Infallible Habit distinct from Faith, when we Assent to the Churches Definitions, seem's to me à new learning, vnknown to Antiquity.

7. Thus much and more well considered, which might be Said in behalfe of Christ's glorious Oracle, And this one Principle.



### 392 Disc. 3. C. 17. *How the Churches Testimony*

Principle added, which all Catholicks grant. viz. That the Church and Scripture Speak alwaies the same truths, and can neuer be at Variance,

*Faith may be resolved into Scripture and the Church together.*

*The reason.*

*Scripture and the Church make but one ioyned indissoluble Motiue*

*An instance*

*How the Church yeild's to Scripture?*

8. Why may we not in this present State, resoluē Diuine Faith into the first Verity Speaking by the Scripture ( or Infal-  
lible Tradition ) and by his own Oracle the Church also? For  
example We belieue the *Sacred Trinity*, the *Incarnation*, *Original Sin* &c. because God reuealed them in Scripture, or first con-  
ueyed them by Apostolical Tradition; But these Verities which  
the Apostles and Euangelists long since made Credible, are now  
remote from vs. without the Churches *rest & Testimony*, whereby  
God ascertain's all in this State, that both Scripture is Diuine,  
and that his Church speak's the very same Verities in Scripture,  
And consequently we Assent to euery particular vpon a Twofold  
Motiue or rather, vpon this *one Formal Obiect*, *ioynly*, and *indis-  
solvly* taken, because Scripture and the Church Assent's them. Nei-  
ther is there the least Difficulty in ioyning one reflex Testimo-  
ny with another former, or anciently deliuered, whereof we  
haue examples in Holy Writ, For we all belieue, God made a  
Couenant with Abraham of multiplying his Seed, because  
*Eternal Truth* said so some Ages before Moses. Again, we be-  
lieue that Verity, because the reflex Testimony of *Moses* reiterat's  
the same Verity, anciently spoken to Abraham. *Gen. 17. 4.*  
Other Instances of the same nature you haue aboue, and more  
are found in Holy Writ.

9. Thus much supposed, It's ( Methinks ) easy to Say ( if all  
be not *de Nomine* ) how the Churches Testimony may in one  
Sense be called the Formal Obiect of Faith, and not in another.  
Consider it as *Diuine*, *infalible*, and *God's own Voice*, proceeding  
from no *humane Authority*, but from the *First Verity* speaking by  
this Oracle, it well merit's the name of a *Formal Obiect*. Compa-  
re it again with the Primary Reuelation, which it only compleat's  
in order to vs, and consequently presupposes more *Ancient*, more  
excellent, and all things considered more worthy, it must yeild to  
Scripture, And may be called an *intrinsicall condition*, whilst it De-  
clares what anciently was Reuealed.

10. Now

Now if any Ask wherein the Excellence and Dignity of Scripture consists, when you compare it with the Churches Definitions? Divines answer. 1. Every word and reason in Holy writ is *de Fide*, but not so, in the Churches Definitions, where the Sense only of the Definitive sentence has weight, as coming from the Holy Ghost's Assistance. 2. The Church has her limits, and Defines nothing but what was long since revealed or necessarily connexed with the ancient Doctrin, And upon this account the Hagiographes are deservedly called our best great Teachers, who made first every Truth they wrote a matter of Faith. 3. When she Church Defines or interprets Gods word, All is done for Scripture, and look'd vpon as the end of Her labours. But what is performed for another, yeild's in worth and weight to that other it is done for, as S. Austin observes. *Lib. de Magist. c. 9.* Whoeuer desires more of this Subject may read Bellar. *Lib. 1. de verbo Dei C. 15.* and Serranus, in *Proleg. 6. 7. 9. 12.*

*The excellen-  
ce and digni-  
ty of Scrip-  
ture,*

*Compared  
with the  
Church,*

11. To solve other difficulties proposed by Sectaries, please to Note first. This Primary Act of Faith. *All are called into the Communion of one infallible Church, whereby God teaches the way to Salvation*, is grounded immediately vpon the Authority of this Oracle, manifested by her Marks and Supernatural Signes, Although yet the Book of Scripture be not admitted as Gods word; Notwithstanding, when it is once owned a Divine vpon Church Authority, I can believe this Oracles Infallibility, with another Act of Faith grounded on Scripture, yet if we make a search into the vltimate Principle, or final Resolvent, of that very Belief, We must as is said above, come at last to Church Authority, whereby Assurance is given, that such a truth is Scripture.

*One Primary  
act of Faith,  
is grounded  
on Church  
Authority,*

*How Scrip-  
ture also tes-  
timonies that  
Faith*

12. Note. 2. This General truth supposed of the Church being immediately Credible, or known by her Motives as an Oracle, which teaches the right way to Salvation, it therefore follows not, that every other particular Verity (for example) the *Epis Supremacy, the Infallibility of Councils &c.* can in like man-  
ner

FFF

394 Disc. 3. C. 12. *How the Churches Testimony*

ner be first and immediately Credible, or believed explicitly, when I Assent to that General Truth, For it is enough that such Particulars, be consequently, or, afterward assented to, vpon the Divine Revelation in Scripture and the Churches own Proposition, as is already declared.

*From other  
particular  
Truths are  
believed af-  
terward.*

13. The Reason is, because the Marks and Motives manifest in the Church immediately induce to believe, that She is God's Oracle, constituted by Providence to guide all in the way of Truth, But how or in what manner this Duty is complied with, must be learned by the Practice and Doctrine of the same Church, by Scripture, and Tradition also. Now that it is most Connnatural to know first in a General way, The Churches Infallibility, before we descend to believe every Doctrine She teaches in Particular, you may well conceiue by the Instance giuen aboue of the blessed Apostles, who first acknowledged Christ our Lord, as a true Prophet sent from God, before they beliqued many other Verities, which afterward were taught by that great Master, and learned by them.

*We under-  
stand by the  
Church, the  
whole moral  
body of such  
Persons as are  
in our Faith.  
Vpon the  
Beliefe of  
Councils  
presupposeth*

14. Note. 3. In the Resolution of Faith into Church Authority, we vnderstand not in the first place the Church Representative, consisting of the Head and Members conuened in General Councils, but rather this whole large diffused Body of Christians vnited in one Beliefe all ouer the world, wherein the way to Saluation is laid forth to all. The Reason of my assertion is, first. Because that more explicite and distinct Faith had of General Councils, Connnaturally, as wee now said, presupposes the other General Truth assented to. Vix. The manifested Society of Christians is God's Church, and the only way to Saluation, and the truth is assented to by Faith, antecedently to the beliefe of the Churches Representation. 2. Because all Catholicks assert, that the whole Moral Catholick Body consisting of Pastors and Hearers, cannot totally err, or Swerue from Christ's Sacred Doctrine: Whence it is, That those Promises of the Gospel. Hell gates cannot preuaile against the Church. The Spirit of truth abides with it for ever, most Properly and Primarily belong

*The promises  
in Scripture  
belong Pro-  
perly to the  
vniversal  
Church.*

belong to this one diffused, and united Society of Christians, To the Pastors as *Teachers*, to the Hearers as *Schollers* or *Learners*. And if the First (according to Christ's promise) teach infallibly, the instructed must learn also *infallibly*. And thus the whole Moral body guided and directed by the Spirit of Truth, is that strong Fortress whereupon all must rely at last, if a right account be given of Faith, or the true Analysis be made. Neither can what is now said, Prejudice in the least the infallible Authority of the *Church Teaching* (I mean of the Pope and Council assembled together) for this notwithstanding, is most properly called the Church, has and holds the keys which it unlock's the Mysteries of Faith, and laies open Explicitly our Christian Verities. Children teach not; Layicks teach not, weomen teach not, Therefore the *Church Representation* properly teaches, although it be not first known, *visu Ananias*, that is, when faith is brought to its last Principles.

*A lawfull representation, properly the Church also*

Note. 4. When Sectaries demand, where doth the Church taken uniuersally as one diffused Body, teach, that She is Infallible, or, that She deliuer's Gods truths, *Whilst yet, neither Scriptures nor Councils which teach so, are reflected vpon, or known in the Priority of nature*, when we believe that great Moral Body is an infallible Oracle. If this I Say be demanded, I Answer by proposing a like Question. Where did Moyses, where did the Prophets, or Apostles explicitly and signally Say at their first appearance: *VVoe are Infallible, wee are the sure Rule of Faith, and such we say it*; you Hearers are obliged to believe. Not a word to this Purpose. What then was done? God Honoured and priuiledged such Persons with Miracles and other visible supernaturall Wonders; These Euidenced, They actually taught the truth, and were credited vpon their Teaching, not because they said in *Actu Signato*, They taught it; but because really they did so in *Actu exercito*, and confirmed all by Signs from Heauen, And thus the Church teaches to this present Day, and our Beliefe.

*All Oracles sent by God to teach, were first made Credible by Miracles,*

*And so the Church was, and is yet.*

## CHAP. XIII.

*Protestants haue no Faith to resolute, And vpon that account are freed from a vicious Circle. Some yet are in a Circle. Two Sorts of Seclaries refused.*

*What the supposed Faith of Protestants, is*

*The Obiect of this Faith must either be their Negatives,*

*Or a Doctrine Common to all Christians.*

*Their Negatives: no revealed Verities.*

1. **I** Prove the first part of the Assertion. The Protestants supposed Faith, is either reduced to the Beliefe of their own Negative Articles, *No Transubstantiation, No Sacrifice of the Altar. No Purgatory &c.* Or, to a Faith common to all called Christians, which consists in believing *One God, and one Iesus Christ, as a Redeemer.* This, or something like it, must be called Faith common to all, For to believe the *Sacred Trinity, the Incarnation,* with other great Mysteries, is no common Faith, because many deny these Articles. Now my Assertion is. What euer can be conceived out of the List of these Negatives, or is not inuolued in that Common Faith, ceaseth to be an Article of Protestancy, *as Protestancy.* For example. To believe one God, is a Tenet common to Jewes, Turks, and Christians, That's no Article peculiar to Protestants. To believe the Sacred Trinity, and the Incarnation, is common to Catholicks, Protestants, and other Heterodox Christians, therefore no singular, no Special Protestant Doctrine. Besides these, imagin whatever can be Imagined, you must either pitch vpon things which, no Christian has obligation to believe, or finally vpon such Doctrines as Catholicks own, and are disowned by Protestants.

2. Thus much Supposed, it is demonstrable, That the Protestant has no Faith to resolute, who first doth himselfe so much Iustice as to Cashiere all his own Negative Articles from being truths spoken by Almighty God, which therefore are.

are not resolvable into the Divine Testimony, because God never revealed any of them. Again, *his Articles* common to all Christians *without more*, cannot be resolved into Divine Revelation, unless, he first excludes with the Arians, The be-  
 liefe of The Trinity and Incarnation, as not necessary to Sa-  
 luation, And afterwards proves by plain Scripture, or the Au-  
 thority of an Orthodox Church, that such an Abstract Doctrin  
 wherein Catholicks, and all Heretiques agree, is sufficient to  
 save Souls. But to Evince either, by Scripture or any Church  
 Authority, will be wholly as impossible, as to prove, that the  
 Negative Articles are Doctrins revealed by God.

2. Vpon these grounds my Proposition stand's so firm, that  
 none can contradict it. For, if whateuer they doe or can be-  
 lieue as *Protestants*, be evidently such Doctrins as God *never re-*  
*vealed*, it's manifest they haue no Faith to resolve, and conse-  
 quently are easily freed from all danger of a vicious Circle;  
 But this is so, For cast away Their Negatiues, All that remains  
 as matter of Beliefe to them, can be no other but the Com-  
 mon faith now mentioned; Or, if they require more as neces-  
 sary to Saluation, *That More* will either be Confessedly no  
 Doctrin revealed by God, Or not peculiar to Protestants. For  
 example. Suppose the Protestant layes Claim to these two Ar-  
 ticles: *Scripture Contain's all things necessary to Saluation.* Or thus.  
*What Scripture speak's plainly is the Protestants Doctrin, and no mo-*  
*re.* I say first. Neither of these Articles are Confessedly truths  
 revealed by God, And this I assert, not only because The Ro-  
 man Catholick Church denies them to be truths, in the Secta-  
 riansense, But vpon this Account Chieffly, that it is impossible,  
 to Show, where or in what passage of Holy Writ, God euer  
 sayd plainly. *Scripture Contain's All things necessary to saluation:*  
 Or that such Doctrins as are plainly expressed there (without more)  
 comprehend Matter enough to Saluation. This cannot passe for an  
 indubitable Principle, whilst euident Experience tell's vs, That  
 such Verities as Sectaries hold clear and indisputable, are yet  
 in this day Controuerted, and not esteemed clear by many,

*A Distin-  
 Commens.  
 all as Va-  
 found, as  
 their Nega-  
 tiues.*

*Their parti-  
 cular Do-  
 ctrins no re-  
 vealed  
 Truths.*

*What Secta-  
 ries account  
 clear Veri-  
 ties, others  
 do not.*



who goe vnder the name of Christians. Obferue well.

4. What Verity can be more clear, then the Incarnation of the Eternal word? Yet Arians deny it. What more clear, then the real Prefence of Christ in the Eucharist? Yet the Caluists reiect it. Therefore when we Come to Examin, which Verities are clearly expreffed in Scripture and which not; we are thrown into a Labyrinth, whilst no other Iudge is made vfe of but the bare words of Scripture, manifestly peruered, when Opposit to the Interpretation of a Vniuersal Church.

*Sectaries  
clearly  
convinced by  
their own  
Principles.*

5. But here is my least Exception. We will Contrary to truth, grant gratis, That Scripture Contain's all things necessarily to Saluation; Wirhall, that the *plain Doctrin* thereof, is matter enough for Beliefe. The Sectary yet gain's Nothing, vnless He descend's to the *Particular Tenets of Protestants* (Mark my words) And truly Assert's. *These and these Doctrins are plainly set down in Scripture. These, and these Doctrins I am (as Protestant) Obliged to believe, vnder pain of Damnation, and no more.* Thus much I say ought to be done, which is vtterly Impossible, And the Reason is. Either those Doctrins layd claim to; will not be plain *expresse Scripture*; Or, if plain and expresse, they cease *eo ipso* to be the *particular Tenets* of Protestants. The last reason of all, rest's vpon a Truth already proued, and T'is, That Protestants haue no Essence of Religion, and therefore haue no Faith to resolve.

6. In passing, you may Ask. What Say we to such Protestants, as make the Negatiues now mentioned, Articles of their Faith? These we dispatch in a word, and vrge them to proue their Negatiues by Scripture, which is impossible. But what is to be done, if they Pretend to belieue the Catholick Doctrins (the *Trinity*, the *Incarnation*, or any other reuealed Mystery) vpon God's diuine Testimony?

*Two sorts of  
Protestants  
refuted.*

7. Here we must distinguish between Protestants and Protestants. The older sort belieue the Scriptures Diuinity attesting the Incarnation, For example, by virtue of a secret and hidden Diuine Spirit of God working in their hearts, this being the only  
light

light or means, whereby that Divinity is laid open to their intellectual Eyes. These inevitably fall into a Circle, for they prove Scripture to be of Divine inspiration; because the Spirit tells them so, And again they believe this interior light or Spirit to be from God, moved thereunto by the very light or letter of Scripture, not known at all to be Divine, but by this hidden Spirit, which is as much unknown as Scripture, without their light. But because the recourse to the Private Spirit in the Resolution of Faith, is amply refuted by every Polemick Author, And now much undervalued by our latter Sectaries, I'll only briefly Propose one Argument against all that Patronize

*The Private Spirit men, plainly in a Circle.*

*It is not  
the same  
thing  
as the  
Scripture*

*A Convin-  
cing Argu-  
ment  
against the  
Private  
Spirit.*

*It is not  
the same  
thing  
as the  
Scripture*

*It is not  
the same  
thing  
as the  
Scripture  
to the internal  
Evidence  
of Scripture.*

*Tradition  
Says  
the Book*

8. Either this Spirit is Scripture; or really distinct from Scripture. Grant the first. Scripture, no Selfe evidence, is yet believed for it selfe only, and so no more is Said, but that Scripture is believed because it is Scripture, without all further Probation. If secondly you distinguish this Spirit or light from Scripture, it followes that the Divinity of Gods word is Assented To, and believed upon a Motive; which is not Gods word, For this supposed Light of the Spirit, not at all contained in Scripture, is no revealed word of God, and consequently Scripture is believed, for That, which is no Scripture.

9. The newer Sectaries with whom Mr Scillingfleet Sides, suppose a fallible Tradition; as a Preparative to receive the meer Books of Scripture; which once owned upon the account of Tradition, The Resolution of their Faith is made into the Divine Light, which Shines in the very Doctrine of God's word; That is, into the rational Evidence thereof. So Mr. Scillingfleet. 226. And P. 222. Discourses thus: Though Tradition doth not open our Eyes to see this light, yet it presents the Object to us in such, and that in an unquestionable manner. To give his Doctrine more Lustre, he sets it forth with the sparkling of a Diamond. May not a man, saith he, very probably believe that a Diamond is sent him from a friend, upon the Testimony of a Messenger who brings it from

yet be fully persuaded of it, by discerning the Sparklings of it? He would say, Tradition resembles the Messenger that hands Scripture to us, but the very innate Splendor and Sparkling of its Doctrine is that, which Faith must be finally resolved into, without regard had to Tradition.

*How these  
men differ  
from the  
Form.*

10. This way of resolving Faith differs from the Former, that it makes the pure Verity of Gods word considered *Obtusely* in it self, the last Resolvent, or the only *Formal Object* of believing, whereas the more aged Protestants superadd to that, an internal vital act, called the *Prinse Spirit*, or an infused instinct of Grace, whereby the Scripture is clearly discerned to be Divine, and into this Instinct, as a *Medium Cognitum*, or the only means *to us* by (which both discover the Scriptures Divinity and it's sense) they resolve their Faith. This way being already rejected.

*The Similitude of a  
Diamond,  
Proves*

11. We now Argue against Mr Stillingfleet, and say first. The similitude of a Messenger delivering the Diamond is nothing to the Purpose, For were that Diamond found in the streets, a skilful Jeweller (And who more skilful then Protestants, when they read Scripture) would soon know its worth by his Art, and presently tell you, whether the Sparkling were Counterfeit or no. Can the Sectary, as easily discover the Divinity in Scripture by its innate Light and Splendor? Speak plainly. If he can, Tradition no more conduces to its Sparkling, then if a Boy first put the Book into our hands, or were found by chance in the Highway, For as the Diamond Sparkles by it self, without dependance of the hand which gives it, so the Scripture must do, if it have that splendor in it, whether Conveyed by Tradition, or not. Nay, if another Scripture were now dropt down from Heaven (were the Parity of the Diamond worth any thing) All skilful and well spirited Protestants might without any Tradition, know it to be Gods word.

*The Disparity plain  
between the  
Diamond  
and Scriptu-  
re*

*This double  
resolution  
Supposed,*

12. Yet more. Our Aduersaries maintain a twofold Resolution of Faith. First into the *Books of Scripture*, and these Books, fallible Tradition without any Divine light seen as yet, Con-  
veys

comes to vs, For Tradition, as they say, is not Diuine. 2. into the internal light of the Doctrin contained in the Books, and into this light of Doctrin they Resolue their Faith, not into Tradition.

13. Now here you shall haue an vnanswerable Dilemma. The Tradition which only Conueyes the Books, as Contradistinct from the internal Doctrin, makes that very Diuine Doctrin to sparkle more, than it would sparkle without Tradition; Or not. If yes: The light, the Splendor the internal Lustre of that Doctrin, Considered as Doctrin, is, and must be independent of Tradition, and Shine as I now said by it Selfe as a Diamond doth, though the Books were found in the Streets. Contrarywise, if the Tradition of the Books Augments in the least, or makes the internal Doctrin there contained to appear more Diuine, than it would appear without Tradition; That very Tradition must be a ioint Motiue, wherevpon we belieue the Diuinity of Scripture. I proue it demonstratiuely. That which laies before the intellectual Eye of a Belieuer, the Lustre, light, and Sparkling of the internal Doctrin contained in Scripture, is the true cause, or a Partial Motiue at least, why He belieues that Doctrin, Tradition doth this, Ergo it is a Partial Motiue why he belieues the Doctrin, Or if it will's not at all to discouer that Lustre of the Doctrin, the precious Diamond of Scripture, may be well discouered and known without Tradition. I would willingly hear what our Adversaries can reply to this very plain, and as I think, no triual Objection, without reminding vs of their killing flies.

*we Argue  
against  
Sectarian*

*The force of  
the Argu-  
ment.*

14. To Say more in this place is needles, hauing proued in the other Treatise that the Maiessty and sparkling of Scripture, lies not in the exteriour Syntax, or in any outward Coniexion of words (common to other pious Books) But Contrarywise, in the Special Assistance wherewith God directed the Hagiographers to write, as also in his own Diuine Volition which Seal'd and approued all that's Writ, as Verities issuing from no other fountain, but from Truth it selfe. Herein con-

*what the  
true Maiessty  
of Scripture  
is.*

G g g g

list's

### 602 Disc. 3. C. 13. Seclaries Faibleſs haue &c.

list's the Dignity, worth, and Maieſty of Holy Scripture.

*The true  
Excellence,  
not diſcon-  
vable by any  
exteriour  
Senſes,*

15. Now becauſe that Diuine Aſſiſtance and God's inter-  
nal Volition, whereby Scripture is approued as moſt ſacred and  
no Objects of ſenſe; It neceſſarily followes, that none can diſ-  
couer the true Excellence of that Holy Book by any Inſpec-  
tion, though moſt diligently made, into the Syntax or outward  
words of it only. Hence I ſaid, Had. s. Iohn not at all re-  
corded that truth in his Goſpel. *The word is made fleſh*, but  
ſome other without Diuine Aſſiſtance, had left the Verity writ-  
ten in Velume, The words and Truth alſo would haue been  
the very ſame, now and then, yet very different in their value  
if Conſidered, as Proceeding from the Spirit of truth in the  
*one caſe*, and from no Diuine Aſſiſtance in the *other*.

*Though the  
Maieſty of  
Scripture lay  
in the words*

*That would  
not anſwer to  
underſtand  
the Senſe.*

16. By this its plain, that the Maieſty of Scripture lies in  
in any expreſſion of outward words. Howeuer admit *gratia*  
did, doth that Maieſty think yee, help any to vnderſtand its  
true Senſe in Matters controuerted? Euidently no. For ma-  
niſeſt experience teaches that whole Multitudes of diſſenting  
Chriſtians, both read and Reuerence the ſame bare letter, Yea  
and haue the ſame Maieſty of words laid open to their view,  
yet ſo notoriously oppoſe one another, and in Points moſt fun-  
damental concerning the genuin Senſe thereof, that plain con-  
tradictions are forced out of this ſacred Book, after their Rea-  
ding. But enough of this is ſaid aboue; And much more  
you haue of Mr Stillingfleets ſtrange way of Reſoluing the  
Proteſtants faith, in the other Treatiſe. Diſcourſe. 1. C. 9.  
Where you may ſee that Proteſtancy is neuer medled with, nor  
brought to any better Reſolution by him, than Arianism or a  
worſer Hereſy. Yet I Say, he took the right Courſe, for in  
real Truth, Proteſtants haue no Faith to reſolue, which truth  
will better appear in the following Chapter where we examine  
whether true Religion Can be found out by Reaſon.

CHAP. XIV.

CHAP. XIV.

*The Mistakes of some Sectaries in this Controuersy. Its necessary to distinguish between true Reason, and fallacious Reasoning. Private Reason liable to Errour. Principles presupposed to the Decision of this Question. Reason easily finds out true Religion, by a rational Evidence previous to Faith.*

1. **S**OME who endeavour to make à Friendly Agreement between Reason and Religion, wholly omit to discusse the mainest point of all, which concern's Christianity. And Tis in à word to tell vs, whether amongst those innumerable Religions now swarming in the world, ( whereof certainly many are false, and Only is true ) men by the force of prudent Reason, can come to the Knowledge of the true One. This is the *Vnum necessarium* worth our knowledge indeed : For, what auailles it to hear of an Agreement between Reason and Religion, if I cannot by the light of Reason find out that Religion which God hath established? It would be but à comfortles Word should One Say. Sir, There is à rich Inheritance in the world belonging to you, but neither you, nor I, nor any other after all diligence vsed, can tell you where, or what it is.

*The Attempt of some Sectaries,*

*who Omit the main Business concerning Religion*

2. This, and it is à grand Omission, may be well grounded on another errour, these Authors Maintain, who first make, à Religion according to their own Phanfy, and then offer to

*The ground of their Omission.*

G g g g 2

Shew



604 Disc. 3. C. 14. *How Reason leads to the*

Shew the Reasonableness of it; Whereas All iustly expect to haue at least in à General way, some Hint of that full Doctrin which Christian Religion comprises, before we Cry it vp as reasonable, or yeild our Assent to it. Thus much neither is, nor can be done by any Sectary; And mark how we are left dissatisfied.

*Their Distinction of Fundamentals and others, improbable,*

3. After some general Duties pointed at, which belong to *natural Religion*, we hear of à Distinction between the Fundamentals of Faith, and Others. Then we are told, that All the Fundamentals, are contained in the Apostles Creed, And that, if we go beyond the Creed for the *Essentials* of Faith, none can Say, where we shall stop. Answ. Sr, you are told in this Treatise where the stop is to be made, And there also, you will find this late Invented Distinction of Fundamentals and no Fundamentals, cast away as vsound Doctrin. All I will Say at present, is, that you build vpon Sand, you make à meer fancied Supposition your Proof, in Calling That à Reasonable Religion, which the greatest Part of Christians rejects, as both false and Improbable.

*Why improbable.*

4. What Scripture I beseech you, what Orthodox Church what receiued Authority; Nay what Reason, euer yet made à few owned Verities (and the fewer the better) of Christian Religion, The whole, the full, and only Essentials of it? If this once passe for sound Learning; I se not why à Turk, that Own's one God, and Christ our Lord as à Very great Prophet, May not as well account those two Articles the Essentials of Christianity, as our Sectaries do their Few Fundamentals; For if we once begin to Diuide Christs sacred Doctrin into different Shreds, *More* and *Lesse* Valuable, Say I beseech you, where shall we stop in the Diuision? And thus your own Question is retorted.

*Nothing lesse, and more valuable in Christs Doctrine.*

*The ground of our Assertion.*

5. You tell vs indeed, you take some few Fundamentals to be Religion, and can proue so much Reasonable. I Answer you Mislake, For no halfe Pieces of Religion can be proued reasonable, without the whole entirely taken, and Assented to.

Here

Here is the Ground of my Assertion, and it is amply Proved in this Treatise. Either All that Doctrin which Christ our Lord taught, And the Church euer since deliuered as Faith, is Fundamental; Or Nothing at all can be Fundamental.

6. Other Flawes I find in this Gentlemans Discourse, but have not time to pursue halfe of them. Here is One, and of main Importance also. He neuer rightly distinguisheth, between that Obiect wherevpon Reason rest's, And the Obiect of Faith<sup>1</sup>, Considered in it self. Reason euer precedes Faith, and is grounded vpon those rational Motiues which Induce to Belieue. Faith, precisely Considered as Faith, relies vpon à quite Different Obiect, God's pure Reuelation, and Cannot Discourse, For the Reasons giuen aboue, not here to be repeated. Only know thus Much in passing, That the wrong done by this Author to the Learned *Perron*, *Veron*, and Others, hath its Origin from this Ouer sight, of not distinguishing between the Obiect of Reason, and Faith. These Saith He, loudly declaim against Reason, All know it very well. I Answer, they declaim against Reasoning or Arguing, in the very intrinseck Act or Tendency of Faith. (For *Fides non quarit cur, aut quomodo*) is most true, and So you and the whole world must do, if you Belieue. They declaim against Reason, or all rational Discourse built vpon Manifest Motiues Inductiue to Faith, is à Calumny, and most vntrue.

7. Another Mistake. The Divine Authority of Scripture, is to be proved by Reason, and only by it. Yet more: The great Argument for the truth of Scripture, is the Testimony of the Spirit in the Miracles wrought by Christ and his Apostles. Sr, I thought ye all pretended to belieue the great Miracles of Christ and of his Apostles by Diuine Faith, founded vpon God's Reuelation in Scripture; This granted, the rational ground why you belieue such Miracles, Cannot be your very Act of believing them, But must be extrinsecal both to your Faith, and its Immediate Obiect. also. What I Say is Manifest, For Questioned

*A want of Distinguishing between the Obiect of Reason, and Faith.*

*Perron and Others Causelessly blamed.*

*Another error.*

Gggg 3.

by

by a few, vpon what *rational ground* (I say *rational*) you be-  
lieue the Incarnation, or any Miracle in Scripture, you will  
not answer the reason of our belieuing is your Beliefe, but  
must fall vpon prudent Motiues extrinsecal to Faith, Other-  
wise you Confound again the Obiect of Faith, with that of  
Reason.

8. You Say moreover. Though Reason Cannot of it Selfe,  
immediatly proue the *truths of pure Reuelation*, Concerning the Tri-  
nity, for example, or the Incarnation; Yet it *Demonstrates* the Diuine  
Authority of the Testimony that declares them; *And that way*,  
(Viz. by demonstrating the Testimony) proues *euen these Articles*.  
This Certainly is a Mistake; First because great Diuines teach,  
That if the Diuine Testimony be demonstrated, Or *evidently* proued  
to exist, The Verity attested by it is also *evidently* known. There-  
fore who euer has evidence of this Truth. *God that Cannot err,*  
*Reveals the Trinity*, must *evidently* infer The Trinity is, And So  
Faith would be eident both in respect of its Formal Obiect,  
and Material also. But here lies not my greatest exception.

*Evidence of  
the Diuine  
Testimony  
infer's evi-  
dence, in the  
thing asse-  
sed.*

9. I say in a word, There is no Principle in Nature or  
Grace which has force to *demonstrate* (and mark my word) That  
God euer said; The Mystery of the Trinity Exist's. And first,  
the Doctrin in Scripture, (no Selfe-Evidence) demonstrates not  
its own Verities. The Beliefe of Orthodox Christians, termi-  
nated vpon the Diuine Testimony, is Faith, and vnder that  
Notion, obscure. Infalible Tradition you own not, and  
Though you did, it would Lay no Evidence of the Diuine  
Testimony before Reason. Nothing then remain's, if you  
seek for Rational Evidence, but that you recurr to the known  
Motiues of Credibility, which Induce to belieue, Now, Sr,  
These Motiues demonstrate not the *Truth* of the *Diuine Testimo-  
ny*, But only make it *evidently* Credible. And here by the way  
I must needs reflect vpon another Mistake. You seem not to  
distinguish between Credibility, and Truth; Nor between Truth  
and Infalible Truth. A thing may be Credible which is fal-  
se: As if three or four of good reputation, for ought I know,  
Should

*No Principle  
gives Evi-  
dence of the  
Diuine Te-  
stimony.*

*Evidence of  
Credibility  
and Eviden-  
ce of truth,*

*Are to be di-  
stinguished,*

### Dist. 3. C. 14. Knowledge of true Religion? 657

Should Conspire to inform me of the death of à Friend in England, who yet liues, The Relation to me would be prudently Credible, yet false. Truth implyes à Conformity with its Obiect, and Cannot be false. Infalible truth in the present matter of Faith, requires moreouer the Influence of Supernatural Principles, whereby the Act of Faith is determined to rest vpon its own Obiect, the First Verity. All these Particulars are largely explain'd in this Treatise.

10. Thus much briefly noted (Though more might be said) we Shall Examin by the help of Good Principles, How far Reason can proceed in Matters of Faith; And whether by prudent reason, all may Come to know, where true Religion is taught and professed?

11. Cardinal de Richelieu. *Traicte pour Conuerir ceux &c.* Lib. 1. C. 11. well obserues with the best Philosophers, That when à Verity stand's sure vpon one clear, rational, and indubitable Principle, its needless (though sometimes not amiss) to bring in more Proofs. For, *frustra fit per plura &c.* One solid Ground is equivalent to many.

12. I am you se engaged to answer the Question proposed. Viz. How far reason is to meddle in matters of Religion, And Say in à word. All debates in this most weightly Affaire, may be decided and easily, by Reason only. But to clear the Assertion from Mistake, we are first To distinguish between à nicknamed or mis-called *Reason*, And that which really is Reason. There being no word more abused, or fallacious than this, which vphold's all the Heresies in the world, Yea and Atheism also. For Euery Atheist, euery Arian, Euery Donatist, laies claim to Reason, And thinks his own Errour built vpon reasonable Grounds.

*All debates concerning Religion may be decided by Reason.*

*This word, Reason, abused by many.*

13. I Say first. The priuate Reason of fallible men; considered as *private* and *fallible*, Discerns not easily between truth and falshood, chiefly when the contest is about this or that particular Controuerly of Religion. The Assertion stand's firm vpon this indubitable Principle. None can prudently acquiesce

*The weakness  
of Private,  
and clouded  
Reason*

acquiesce in so weighty a matter as Religion is, to that which of its own nature may probably bee clouded with Ignorance and Errour (to say nothing of passion) And for that cause, seems vnable to discern between Truth and falshood, But the priuate Reason of fallible men considered as *private and fallible*, may be so clouded, that it discern's not between Truth and falshood, Therefore 'Tis most vnmeet to decide in particular Controversies.

*An Instance*

14. To confirm what I Say: Imagin that a Protestant and an Arian, were at an earnest dispute concerning That which each Party believes. Both plead by Reason. What resist think ye can follow vpon the contest, whilst both the one and other may iustly auouch, Neither of vs know our own Ignorance or weakness? Therefore vnless you with whom I Argue can ascertain me, And I you, That our Reason is purely disinteressed, free from mistake, and all clouds of Ignorance, We must of necessity quit this Tribunal of our own priuate Reasoning, and take recourse to some Iudge that giues Satisfaction, And finally declares, whose reason is more reasonable.

*The chiefest  
Obiection of  
Sethians,*

*Proposed in  
their own  
Terms,*

15. One may Reply, And 'tis the only Obiection of Sethians. Were it possible to find out such a Iudge (as it is not) the priuate Reason of these two Disputants, And of euery other particular Man, is, in points of Religion to ponder well the Sentence giuen, 'Tis He, and no other, that must conclude within his own Interiour, whether the Sentence giuen be reasonable or no, And consequently the last Vmpirage, the final Decision of all in the choise of Religion, is brought to euery Mans priuate Reason. *Here is the true Rule of Faith*, (Say these) when that choise is made; For to say Men are damned for not following the Iudgement of another, whilst their own Reason hold's it not Reasonable to do so, is harsh Doctrin, dissonant to the Principles of nature it selfe, And to all Evangelical liberty. Wherefore though Atheists, Iewes, and Turks be iustly reprehensible, because they abuse the Principle of follo-

# Disc. 3. C. 14. Knowledge of true Religion. 609

following Private Reason, yet Sectaries who use the Principle with moderation, And ever believe something within the compass of Christianity, seem not blamable. Here you have the Ground of all Heresy.

16. To Overthrow this false Pretence, and to lay before you a manifest Truth, its necessary to premise a few *Postulata*, before we come to our Second Proposition. I Suppose first, with all Christians (Jewes and Turks accord also) That God has established one true Religion only, The Verities whereof, *a revealed by the first Verity*, are infallible. I Suppose. 2. The end why he revealed these Truths, was that all Should believe them, and *believing*, gain eternal Happines. Now seeing the Apostle. 2- Tim. 1. 12. send's afore his Beliefe a measure or degree of *knowledge*. *Scio cui credidi*, I first know, it followes, that all prudent Believers must have the Evidences of Credibility, before they elicit Faith. I Suppose. 3. That God's eternal Design in establishing Religion ( which comprises revealed Truths ) was to have it known or found out by easy means, obvious to the Reason of every one, learned or unlearned. And certainly its far more easy, to know by sensible Marks and Signatures, where, and by whom true Religion is taught, than with an industrious and almost endless Scrutiny, to find it out by examining every particular Tenet, contained in it.

*Principles premised to the*

*Decision of this controversy.*

*Two Reasons shewing,*

17. The Ground hereof is clear, for true Religion cannot but Shew its own facile, Obvious Marks, and rational Discernibility, Otherwise the Ignorant and Unlearned, would be exempted from all obligation of believing, seeing none can Assent to the high Mysteries of Faith, without Precious Evidence of Credibility, laid forth to Reason.

18. Now if you Reply, The learned in case of Ignorance and obscurity are to instruct the illiterate, I Answer, That's very true, But if after all Instruction they bring not the Learner to a due Degree of previous Evidence, The Instruction void of substance becomes both vain and fruitless. Again. And here is my second Ground. The Purpose of Almighty God in found-

*why true Religion is easily found out.*

H a h h

ding



ding Religion, was not to puzzle Mens wits with it, or to set them at endless debates concerning so weighty a Concern, But if it be not obuius and easily found out by its own rational, and clear Indications represented to Reason, There arises (not from Mans malice as now a dayes fall's out) But from the very Nature of it, eueralsting Quarrells, which breed distrust, and rather inuite all to loath, then to loue Religion.

*The Sects.  
ries way of  
Seeking it,*

19. Hence I boldly Assert, could Religion not be known without so many Injunctions, as Sectaries vsually lay vpon vs. Were it not attained, before an exact perusal made of the Fathers, and Councils large Volumes. Did it lye in Obscurity, till such and such Inferences were drawn out of Scripture: Had it dependance vpon This and That Deduction framed by euery fancy, that reads Gods word, were Libraries to be turned ouer, and Languages to be learned as necessary to settle all in Truth. Could I Say, none come to the true knowledge of Religion without without so much Adoe, And so many endless Incumbrances, The most of men might well Supercede all further Disquisition, and rightly Iudge, all further Enquiry too intricate for them, being out of the reach of that wee call, *easy and obuius Reason*. God I am sure, Disowns such Perplexity in the Religion he founded, who tell's vs Deuter. 30. 11. His commands (And what's more seuerely commanded then to embrace reuealed Truths) are not hid from vs, nor farr off. We need not to ascend to the Heauens, or Cross the Sea to find them out. No. The Word is neer to vs, in our mouth and heart &c. But of this enough aboue.

*long, tedious,  
and dissatisfactory.*

*The word of  
truth is  
neer vs,*

20. A second Proposition. Reason clear from Passion find's out (and easily) True Religion by an vndoubted Euidence, before debates arise concerning particular Controuersies. One Proof of our Assertion is already hinted at. God obliges all to embrace true Religion, and consequently afford's means to know it, for to Say on the one side, He will haue vs to belieue, and on the other, not clearly to giue light concerning what wee are obliged to belieue, is to assert that His Goodnes Abandon's the

### Disc. 3. C. 14. Knowledge of true Religion. 611

the care of our Salvation, and leaves all in darkness Now further. The clear obligation of believing arises not from Faith in Selfe, nor from the Evidence of the Mysteries assented to, for no man saith (as is often noted) *I believe because I believe, or because I see the Divine Mysteries Evidently in Themselves*, but contrarywise Hee Speaks thus: *I therefore believe, because I find my selfe antecedently to my Faith, obliged to submit to the Divine Testimony with a most firm Assent*, But that which laies so strong an obligation on him, must of necessity be a clear Indgement grounded upon Obiective Evidence, nothing less certain, can avail in this weighty affair concerning Faith.

*The Obligation of believing arises from*

*a clear Evidence, known before we believe*

21. I proue the Assertion. Whoever firmly believes upon Gods infallible Revelation must antecedently Iudge, He cannot err by believing; or, if He Iudges he may err or be deceived, it is impossible to believe firmly upon the Divine Revelation. What I Assert is clear; For to Say, I will infallibly believe because God Speaks infallibly, and withall to keep in mind this Indgement. *I may be deceived by my Faith*, is plainly to Say, I doe that which my Conscience tells me cannot be done, Therefore that previous light must arrive to Evidence of the Obiects Credibility, whereof more presently.

*The Assertion Proved,*

22. Now you shall see how the force of our Argument hinted at, is drawn from the Obligation of believing. Ask any whether one thought ready to elicit Faith, hold's himselfe bound to Assent with a firm Adhesion, because God speaks; Or Contrarywise, stand's as yet Howering and uncertaint, what to doe. In case he clearly sees his Obligation, that necessarily implies the evident Indgement we plead for, And hence arises a firm Faith. But if He remains in a wauering Condition, ambiguous whether to believe or no, He can no more resolve to Assent firmly upon Gods infallible Testimony, than one in a Journey doubting which of two wayes to follow, can prudently preferre the one before the other. A Indgement then which brings all to an inuariabile State of believing, is absolutely necessary: And hence Diuine Teach, that none can believe before he finds

*The Argument taken from the Obligation of believing*

*Further urged,*

H h h h 2

himselfe

612 Disc. 3. C. 14. How Reason leads to the

himselfe obliged to doe so, And when Hee sees clearly that obligation, he is bound vnder Sin to belieue.

*Rash Faith,  
blamable*

*Sectaries  
from so  
disown it.*

23. A further Reason hereof is thus, and seem's very convincing. Whoeuer belieues induced by a doubtful, or probable Iudgement, without that degree of Euidence now mentioned, may lustily fear least by his too forward Assent, He imputes to God a falshood, reckoning that amongst the Articles of his overhasty Beliefe, which was neuer reuealed. This open wrong Sectaries endeauour to auoyd, who before they belieue the Verities in Scripture, Prerequisite a high Moral certainty grounded on Vniuersal Tradition, whereby Assurance is giuen that the Books are Diuine. As therefore a meer probability would be too weak an Inductiue, to lead in that Faith, they pretend; So it would be in our case also, and Consequently all must Come to a degree of Credible Euidence preuius to Faith, or Faith cannot stand firmly grounded.

*Three diffi-  
culties, con-  
cerning this  
Euidence.*

24. Now seeing Euidence is necessary. There difficulties may occur concerning it. The first. What we vnderstand by the Euidence hitherto only spoken of in General Terms. 2. From whence it proceeds? 3. What Christians haue it? These particulars discussed, we shall easily make way to our third Proposition, as also to the last Decision of the Difficulty proposed.

*What this  
Euidence  
implies?*

25. Briefly, Euidence in this matter of Religion implies so strong a light, so great a Moral certainty (at least) That euery well disposed Understanding, may without fear or hesitancy boldly Say, *God founded this Religion. If this be error, you great Sou-  
rain haue deceived vs. This or none is the sure Way to Salvation. All  
other Sects are improbable.* And to this sense that stout Champion of Iesus Christ F. Edmund Campian Spake vndantedly. *Totus  
Dei Solium, & illud tribunal ad quod stabo &c.* I call Heauen to witness, And that high Tribunal where I shall once stand to giue an Account of all I haue said. *Aus nullum Calum esse,  
aus nostrorum esse.* That is. Either we Catholicks are right in Faith, or There is no Faith. Either Heauen is Ours, or there is no such thing as Heauen. The Euidence here touched on,

though

# Disc. 3. C. 14. Knowledge of true Religion? 613

though called Moral, is not yet inferiour to Physical certain-ly, but beares that name, because the Nature and Tendency of it is such, And of so great Conuiction, that it quits every rational Man of doubt, and peaceably settles the mind in a quiet State, when the choise is made of true Religion. Arnob. Lib. 2. Cent. Gent. Proues the truth here asserted by and excellent Argument à Posteriori. *Nisi aperta res esset* &c. Unless, saith he, Christian Religion had been manifest and more clear to all than Daylight, *Incredulum humanum Genus* &c. Mans nature most incredulous and hard of beliefe, would neuer haue consented to the difficult Mysteries of it. Hence S. Austin. Lib. de verâ Relig. C. 2. Tells vs, none can doubt which amongst so many Religions is true, And the only safe way to Saluation. S. Chrysostom. serm. Quod Christus sit Deus. Saies more. Viz. That the Man is wholly stupid, Mad, and deuoid of sense, who sees not so clear an Euidence, or, goes about to Contradict it.

Why Called Moral?

Arnobius his Argument.

S. Austin and S. Chrysostom accord.

26. The Reason hereof more largely handled in the other Treatise. Disc. 1. C. 8. is taken first from the Infinite knowledge and power of Almighty God, who in founding Religion engaged as it were in a Dispute with Hell, Heresy, and all Opposers. He engaged; Therefore Hee is sure to Conuince, otherwise it had been vain to haue Commenced the Dispute (He began it not either to bee foiled, or to haue it end in shame, or finally to leaue the matter doubtful). Now further, if He bee sure to Conuince and conquer, Hee doth it by the power and efficacy of rational Arguments, laid forth to all that haue the vse of Reason, For, He Argues in behalfe of these: But dear Arguments are potent Orators, and plead so powerfully that they induce Reason to acquiesce, and quit the vnderstanding of all doubt. Herein lies the Euidence wee enquire after, whereof more presently.

The founded mind Ground of our Assertion.

27. I Say Clear. For were the Arguments doubtful, all would be left in Suspence which Religion to embrace. Were they only probable (or more probable) then the pretended Arguments of Sectaries, of Arians (for Example) are, They destroy

Probability insufficient.

Hhhh 3;

not

# 614 Disc. 3. C. 14. How Reason leads to the etc.

*The Strength  
of this Evi-  
dence.*

not to *ipse* Probability in Arianism, or in any other false Sect. Therefore the Conviction drawn from these Arguments must be so strong, That one (as is now noted) may without Hesitancy boldly Say first. Induced by the force of Evidence, its manifest to reason that God has founded one only true Religion. 2. Induced by the force of Evidence, Its manifest, This and none but this, is the Religion, He founded. 3. Induced by the force of Evidence, its manifest to reason, that All other Sects called Religions are false, And not only false, but in the highest degree *perniciously* improbable.

*The works in  
nature speak  
Gods power  
and Wisdom*

28. These Assertions Stand firm, vpon this one Principle. God Gouvern's the world (whereof no Christian doubts). He giues Being to evey creature; His Power and Wisdom are most discernable by these works in Nature. And shall we haue no clear knowledge think ye of his Wisdom, care, and singular Prouidence drawn from the Noble works of Grace, laid open to all Mens View, and most manifest before our Eyes, in that admirable Fabrick of true Christian Religion, founded by him? Shall the works in Nature speak plainly their Creator, And the Admirable wonders of Grace, be silent of their Author? The common Sense of all rational men disclaims the Paradox, And must, if induced by Reason, acknowledge an Evidence in that Oracle whereby God vouchsafes to Speak. But if a false Sect could either Surpasse in its Marks and Indications (or so much as Equalize) The true Religion, That Specious Evidence leading to belieue would Cease, and be so much Eclypsed that none could by the force of Reason Say. *This is the Way that leads to Heaven. This is the Religion which God founded*, And consequently all might shake of the Obligation of belieuing, seing none can belieue without a preuius Clear knowledge had of what, He is bound to Assent to. The Religion therefore, I am obliged to liue and dye in, must bee Clearly made discernable by its Marks, from all false Spurious Sects, or This obligation ceases, whereof enough is said already.

*And shall  
the manifest  
works of  
Grace be si-  
lent?*

CHAP. XV.

From whence the Evidence hitherto mentioned Proceed's? That Religion only is reasonable, which Heaven declares reasonable. The Declaration is evidently made in behalfe of the Roman Catholick Religion. VVho is the misled reasoning Man? Other Particulars handled. The readiest way to Convince Sectaries.

IT remains now to Examine from whence the rational Evidence here pleaded for, proceeds? Methinks That receiv'd Maxim in Schools. *Qui dat Formam dat Consensum ad formam*, Help's much to Answer pertinently; For if the Cause that giues à Thing being, giues it also what's consequent or belongs to its Being, And if all Vnanimously agree concerning the Cause and Author of true Religion, This necessarily followes,

1. The same God and infinite Goodnes that founded Religion, laies also be fore vs the Evidence we Propugn. But an Evidence proceeding from such an Author (whose works are perfect) and is annexed to the Religion which Wisdom it self giues Being to, must needs bee clear, and haue force to Convince the most obdurate hearts; May Prudence Sway, and Passion be laid aside. To explicate what is here said, to proue it: All know that God, who will haue vs walk to our last End by obscure Faith, giues no Evidence of the Mysteries Considered in Themselves, For none knowes the

Trinity,

God who founded Religion.

Lays forth its rational Evidence.



# 616 Disc. 3. C. 13. One only Religion reasonable

It is called  
the Evidence  
of Credibili-  
ty.  
On what it  
is grounded.

Trinity, or that great work of the Incarnation by any Evident Principle clearly proposed to Reason, Therefore the Evidence we seek after, must be Extrinsic to the Mysteries believed, which Divines rightly call the Evidence of Credibility, and it is grounded upon those visible supernatural works of Grace, which an infinite Power only can produce, And upon this ground I Said, The same God that found's Religion, laies before the Eye of reason its rational Evidence also.

Heavens de-  
claration.

Supernatu-  
ral Signs.

Publicly  
approved.

Admirable  
Conversions.  
Never Cen-  
sured.

That gives  
Assurance.

3. Hence I boldly Assert (and 'Tis no less of singular comfort to all Faithful believers, then of shame and Confusion to Iewes and Heretiques). That Religion only is reasonable (and brings with it an Obligation of believing) which Heaven it self declares reasonable. That Religion only is reasonable, which Evidently beares the Marks, the Characters, and Supernatural signatures of an infinite Power and Wisdom. That Religion only is reasonable, which has been approved by the publick Iudgement of the very best, the most choise and learned, who have lived since the Creation of the World. That Religion only is reasonable, which by Gods special Assistance hath wrought Strange Conversions, gives in Evidence of undoubted Miracles, perseverance, and has never yet Censured by any known Orthodox Christian. That Religion finally, is only reasonable, which Assures every one by a present Universal Tradition of a Church diffused the whole World over, What God has Said, what Christ hath taught, and what Doctrine the Apostles preached. Here is both Reason and (in Tradition) the Rule of Faith with it. Find me out then such a Faith, such a Religion, as evidences these Illustrious Marks, the Cognifances and Signs of Heaven, that's only reasonable, or none ever was, or can be accounted Reasonable.

What, or what  
Religion can  
show these  
Marks and  
Signs?

4. We are now in the last place to Examin, what Prophet, what Teachers, or finally what Church, have been Signalized with these strong pleading Testimonies, with these Signs and Marks of Power, and Wisdom? The Iewish Church had them in some measure, when Almighty God, Exodus. 9. 16. told Moses *Posui te &c.* I have placed thee my Servant, *vt. ascendam in te. fortitudinem meam*, in thee

my Power and Might. And that by thee, my name may be spoken of through the whole earth. Certainly Christ our Lord manifested yet far greater Wonders. John. 15. 24. If I had not done among them works which no other Man hath done &c. Whilst the blessed Apostles preached, none can doubt of their Miraculous Signs, which Heavens Evidenced, and God himselfe manifested by them. Thus much supposed, and no Sectary can Question the certainty of my Supposition.

4. I will come neerer home, And to lay Forth the Evidence of the Roman Catholick Church, Speak this great truth. None but She, ever Since those Apostolical times, hath had not only the like Unity in Faith, The like Supernatural Marks and wonders wrought in Her, by an Infinite Power and Wisdom; but also more Miracles, greater Conversions, a greater number of Believers, and Consequently a more Universal consent of Hearts joyned together in one Beliefe. In a word as full an Evidence every way, as the Apostolical Church was made glorious withall. Therefore Reason cannot but acknowledge, that this Oracle ever since these first blessed Men preached, is the only Marked and Manifested Church in the world. Deny the Evidence we Propugn; its own Sensibility and Visibility Obvious to all, that have Eyes to see, or Eares to hear, is our Proof, And because it stand's upon clear Principles both Sensible and Visible, we do here Challenge all the Heathens, all the Jewes, and all the Sectaries in the world, to bring to light any thing like it, in behalf of that they call Religion. But there is no way hereof. For such an Attempt would be desperate, yea verily impossible.

6. Now if on the other side, the Evidence here pleaded be granted the Church, Wee have our Intent, For this Principle stand's firm. Where God presents the same Evidence of Credibility, Where He sets before all the legible Characters, the Publick Signatures of his own Power and Wisdom, There Reason cannot but acquiesce. By such lights and no other, it must be guided, and take direction to find out Truth. Vpon these Grounds,

liii

7. I Say

*The effects of power and wisdom*

*resplendent in the Marks of the Roman Catholick Church*

*The Evidence becomes Sensible, its undoubted*

*If granted, we have our Intent.*

618 Disc. 3. C. 15. *One only Religion reasonable.*

*By what  
Reason true  
Religion is  
found.*

*True and  
mistaken Rea-  
son, distin-  
guished.*

*What part  
of that  
false reason  
imparts of  
Faith?*

*By all sayd  
we better  
understand  
what is  
meant by  
Reason.*

7. I Say lastly. True Religion is easily discovered by Obvious reason, And in this sense, Reason Regular's Faith, but know withall; That, that Mans Reason only is reasonable in this weighty matter, which has for its Object the Signal Marks of an Infinite Power and Wisdom. now hinted at, and Argues by them. Whoeuer therefore makes choise of Religion, and is not induced to believe by these publick Indications, which Heaven manifest's, err's grossly, is seduced, and ludges falsly. And thus we distinguish between false and true Reason. The mistaked discoursing Man makes his own formal Act, Reason, whilst he pitches on a Doctrin, and auouches that reasonable, before he knowes by any rational Motiue, whether God be Author of it or no. So Sectaries proceed in euery thing they believe, as *Protestants*. Contrarywise, One that's guided by right and prudent Reason See's, before He believes (*Scio cui credidi*) that weighty Obiectiue Euidence, whereby Millions haue been gained to Christ. Hence I Say. As that Man only believes with Divine Faith, who Assents vnto what God has Reuealed, So He only followes true Reason, who is induced to believe vpon God's own Euidence, laid forth to Reason. For I hold this Principle indubitable. The Author of Religion, giues it also a rational Euidence of Credibility. Whoeuer followes not that Light, run's astray, and cannot beliene.

8. By all hitherto noted wee may yet more clearly Discover, what is meant by this word, Reason, in our present Controuersy? Briefly, it imports (as is already said) an Intellectual light grounded vpon the Euidence of Supernatural Motiues, which God from the beginning of Christianity, hath manifested to euery rational Vnderstanding, and by it induced the wisest of the world, to become Orthodox Christians.

9. A second Inference. By this easy obuius Rule of Reason grounded vpon rational Motiues, All Controuersies relating to Religion are clearly ended. For find me out the forementioned Euidence of Credibility, Those signal Marks, I mean of an Infinite Power and Wisdom, We haue with them the manifested Oracle, whereby God Speaks to the world. Now who-

euert

ever refuses to hear God's own Language spoken by such an Oracle, is of necessity thrown into a State of perplexity, For thus, if reason regulates, he must Discourse. Shall I deny this Evidence of *Miracles*, of *Conversions*, of *Univerſality* to the Roman Catholick Church? I deny that which the whole world owns, and is viſible to Sense. Shall I grant all, and Say its forceleſſ, or inſufficient to induce to believe that Oracle? I Destroy the rational Evidence of Chriſtianity, yea of the Apoſtles Themſelves, And cannot believe either Prophet or Apoſtle, were ſuch Meſſengers ſent now from Heaiven to teach me. For no particular Prophet, no Apoſtle, ever ſhewed the like full Evidence of Credibility, as this one Oracle has manifested to the world, for ſixteen Ages.

*Contradictions added, by reason.*

*How Reason diſcourſes in this matter of Religion.*

*Sectaries follow no probable way of ending Contradictions.*

*The Reason why they cannot.*

*and under*

10. A. 3. Inference. Sectaries never yet took, nor can take the eaſy, right, and Reasonable way of writing, much leſſ, of Ending Controuerſies. This one Principle proves the Aſſertion. As the Truth of Chriſtian Doctrin ſtands firm, when an Evidenced Church teaches it, So by the Nullity of an Evidenced Church, you may, in this preſent State, eaſily gather the vncertainty, and falſhood of any Doctrin taught Contrary to that Oracle. But moſt evidently Sectaries have no Evidenced Church which ever taught their Doctrin, or oppoſed ours; Therefore they are impoſſibilitated to write, much more to follow any ſhort, eaſy, or rational way of ending Controuerſies, by an *Evidenced, Oracle*, which yet as St Austin cited above againſt the Donatiſts ſaith, is, in the firſt place to be found out. This found by her Marks, and Signatures (And *Digito demonſtrari poſſeſt* Adds the Holy Doctor, its pointed out with your Finger) all further Conteſt ceases, or might we ſpeak in Cardinal de Riclelieu's own words, ſarely quoted, *ſeems little proſtable, becauſe The true Church cannot but aſcertain all of true Doctrin.*

11. Hence you have a 4<sup>th</sup> Inference. Sectaries who in all their quarrelling Potenticks Still inſiſt vpon particular Controuerſies. *The Real preſence, Tranſubſtantiation, The worſhipping of*

670 Disc. 3. C. 15. *One only Religion reasonable,*

*Scholars  
make known  
the weakness  
of their own  
cause.*

*Scholars  
making an  
Evidenced  
Church,*

*are driven  
off all  
grounds  
of Arguing*

*what is to  
be judged  
reasonable?*

Images &c. And dare not so much as offer to have their Protestantism tryed by the Iudgement of any Evidenced Orthodox Church, Publish to the World the Weaknes of their indefensible Cause, and plainly give over to plead by Reason.

12. I'll tell you a Story for the substance very true, concerning a Discourse between a Pert Nouellist, and a Catholick. The first would needs debate the Controversy of the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist. The Catholick, though not very learned, yet of a good Iudgement, willing to see some effect of the Conference, prudently demanded, vpon what Grounds the Dispute was to be held on, and finally ended? The other replied vpon Scripture, But said the Catholick, what shall be done, If you and I agree not about the Sense of Scripture? *Nouellist.* We are if things be so, to Appeal to the Fathers. *Cath.* But what if we vary as much about the Sense of Fathers, as about Scripture? *Nouellist.* Wee are then to recurr to the Primitive Church, and examin what Doctrine She deliuered, relating to our Question in those purer times? *Cath.* O Sr. Wee are yet in Darkness, far off from the last found Principle, For how shall you and I, after our priuate perusing those few ancient Records left vs, end our debate, whilst you'l turn them to one Sense, and I to another? *Nouel.* Reason shall end all. *Cath.* That I wish for, But quit me yet of one Scruple. What if your priuate Reason be byassed one way, and mine another? Or, what if you Iudge that Reasonable, which I doe not? Here the Nouellist like one struck dumb, spake not a word.

13. Yet the Discourse might well haue gone on, for I would haue further inquired, whether to do as all the Christians in the world, leamed and vnelearned haue done, be not reasonable? None can deny it. Then I would haue interred. But all these Innumerable Christians, The very Apostles themselves, and others haue vpon prudent Motiues Constantly iudged it reasonable, to submit to Mysteries about the reach of humane Reason, Ergo that must pass as a reasonable Principle



Principle; But the Reason cannot be taken from the very *Assumption*, For that is Faith, nor from any Evidence in the Mystery believed, or obscurely proposed, nor finally from Scripture alone, for that Book Considered in it self, is not its own Evidence, Therefore the Evidence of Credibility, Or the Evidence Proposed to Reason, is extrinsecal to what ever I believe, and fundamentally lies in the Marks, and Signatures of Christs own manifested Church.

*The Eviden-  
ces of Credi-  
bility, not in-  
fer'd from  
Faith.*

14. Hence I Conclude with this Dilemma, and hold it unanswerable. Either God has set before all Mens Eyes An Oracle (which now teaches truth) most discernable by clear Marks and Motives from all false erring Societies, Or omitted to do so. Grant the first, Reason is as much obliged to believe that Signalized Oracle now, As the Primitive Christians were anciently bound to believe the Apostles. Say Contra. 13. There is no such Marked Oracle distinguishable from erring Sectaries, Reason is left in a Labyrinth, and shall never find out true Religion, Wherefore Protestants who seemingly stand for Reason, and slight the Doctrin of our Evidenced Church, are the men amongst all other, most unreasonable, and a daily experience reaches, meer Scepticks in matter of Religion.

*A Convinc-  
ing Dilem-  
ma.*

*Sectaries un-  
reasonable.*

15. A 5th. Inference. The readiest way to convince a Sectary (and one though no great Clerk may easily do it) is in the first place, at least, to waive that long tedious work of handling particular Controuersies (which depend vpon Authority) and to plead by Reason; Thus I would Argue, and have often done so, with good Success. You as a Protestant, lay claim to a Reasonable Reformation, and consequently to a Reasonable Religion, Say I beseech you, from whence have you the Moral Evidence, which makes this Reformation Credible to Reason? I speak not yet of it's Truth, for Evidence of Credibility presupposes the assuming of it true.

*How they  
are easily  
Convinced.*

We Catholicks proceed candidly, and propose to the reason of every one learned and unlearned, the very Marks and Signs of truth, manifest in our

*Evidence of  
Credibility is  
first to be  
laid forth.*



612 Disc. 3. C. 15. *One only Religion reasonable,*

Church, which Christ our Lord and the Apostles evidenced to the first Converted Christians. You set vp à new faced Religion, and when that's done, put it out of Countenance, because Reason sees nothing in it, which has appearance of Credibility. You auouch it true, before you make it *Credible*, which is to put the Conclusion before the Premises.

*Sectaries  
auouch their  
reformation  
true, before  
it be made  
Credible.*

16. One perhaps will Say first. The reason of your Reformation stand's vpon this rational Ground, that wee Catholics were deformed, or out of all right fashion in our Religion. Lanementable. And are you the doughty Doctors that must mend what was marred, and prescribe à new Model of Religion? Can you Say what is, or what is not Catholicism? It is too much Boldnes not only to teach more learned then you Selues, But à high Iniury also, to make à meer *Supposition* (and very false too) to pass for à rational Proof. You know wee deny your improbable Supposition, And you vpon no Principle call it reasonable. Howeuér, Suppose the falshood, that wee are out of Fashion, doth it therefore follow that you are got into the right *Mode* of Religion? No truly, If the Supposition stand's, wee are both out, And both need à new Reformation.

*They make  
à false sup-  
position, their  
Proof.*

17. Some may yet Reply. Sectaries regard not that new coyned word of *Euidēt Credibility* (à Term wholly Popish) They endeaour to proue the *Truth* of Protestancy by Scripture and Fathers, And to do so much, is more than to make it *Credible*. Contra. 1. Were it possible (as it is not) to proue the truth of *Protestancy*, That's besides the matter here in hand, whilst wee only Treat of *ending Controuersies by Reason*. Now all know that Authority, whose *Credibility* must first be Euidenced before it haue weight (*precisely considered as Authority*) is not the *Reason here spoken of*. For Example: I Assent to the Mystery of the Incarnation vpon Gods own *Authority*, that's Faith, but no *rational Inducement* to belieue. What we demand of Sectaries, is to haue the rational Motiues which induce to belieue *this Protestancy*, laid open before the Eyes of rational men?

*They are still  
besides the  
matter now  
agitated.*

Hercin

Which we require Satisfaction, but have none.

18. Contra. 2. Could these men prove their Protestantcy by Scripture and Fathers, it should, Methinks, be very easy to point at an Orthodox Church which Six Ages since, publicly owned the particular Tenets of it. Here is my Reason. What our Doctrin the Scripture and Fathers teach, the Orthodox Church conceal's not, but openly Professeth. She is not ashamed, if Orthodox, to teach what God has revealed. Now further. Had such a Church euer owned this Reformation, it must either have been like an invisible Ghost, not perceptible (which our Newer Sectaries Disclaim) or contrarywise discernible, by the like Marks and Signatures of the Apostolical Church, And if their Doctrin was euer taught by it, They are to talk no more of its Truth, before Its Credibility be evidenced to Reason, by the Marks and Signs of that Church, which is now supposed to have taught pure Protestantcy. That is in a word, They are first obliged to Say plainly, what Articles of Faith, Protestants (as Protestants) hold Essential to their Religion, And then to make so much Doctrin, and no more, first *credible*, then *true*, by the known Authority of an Orthodox Church. But This is impossible. Hence.

*If the Reformation could be proved true,*

*Some Orthodox Church must have owned it.*

19. And it is the last Inference, whereby one grand Cheat of our Sectaries is discovered. Long have we inquired but without Satisfaction, *Where their Church was before Luther?* The Common Answer returned by some latter Protestants, making little Account of an invisible Church, is much to this Sense. *Our Church was there where it now is, and where it alwayes was, The same Christian Church as before the Reformation, Having lost nothing that made it so.* And if you Object. The Church in England before Luther was certainly Popish, now its Protestant, *Is it is not the same Church, They Answer and vow it to be the very same, though it ceased to hold Popery.*

*How our Adversaries Shuffe.*

20. Much might be said against these meer Empty words. I'll here only entertain you with two Reflections vpon the whole Paralogism. First it makes the worst of Heresies defensible, for

614 Disc. 3. C. 15 *One only Religion reasonable &c.*

*They make  
the worst of  
Heretics de-  
fensible,*

*And their  
Reformation  
unreasonable,*

*Beaumont's  
strip's of all  
rational Mo-  
tives.*

*Sollers's fol-  
low the  
strain of  
Condemned  
Hereticks,*

*No Motives  
Proposed to  
Reason.*

For might not Arius have pleaded in like manner. My Church is where it was before, The very same Christian Society, though changed into *Arianism*, as the ancient Religion in England, now is into *Protestantism*. So also the *Pelagians*, The *Macedonians*, and all other Heretiques could have Argued, excepting perhaps a few *Donatists*, who confined the whole Church to their little Part in Affrick. Again, As the Thing is reformed, it passes with Protestants for a Part of the Catholick Church. Therefore *is reformed*, its supposed a Piece of Reasonable Religion (Sectaries pretend not to an unreasonable Reformation) And it be So, before the Professors of it talk of the Truth of this Reformation, They are obliged to make it Credible, by such Miracles, Signes, and wonders as an Infinite Power and Wisdom (and no other) Proposes to Reason. But all is contrary. They begin, and bring in a Reformation so naked and strip'd of rational Motives, that none can Say. God himselfe declares it reasonable, by any Signature, which may bee esteem'd an effect of his Power and Wisdom, Or in a word Supernatural.

21. And here in passing, You have the true Reason, why Sectaries in their Polemicks, keep close to the Procedure of all condemned Hereticks. The Arians, for Example, never went about to giue Reason the least Satisfaction, in behalfe of their Rupture made with the Church, but leaning that Rational way, pleaded by Scripture. So do Protestants. Before they had Shown any thing like a rational Evidenced of Creditability, to countenance that shameful Divorce, They voted it lust. So do Protestants. Waiting the Ancient Sense of Scripture received by the Church, they gloss'd it after their fashion. So do Protestants. Tradition, that strong Tenure whereby the Church hold's Her best Inheritance, or Derives Christ's Doctrin down from Age to Age, The Arians slighted, And so do Protestants. But All this while, though we earnestly wish to hear of Motives proposed to Reason, whereby this Reformation may be made Credible, we are turn'd off with meer Talk, And never yet heard, or shall hear of more Evidenced for *This*, than the worst of Arians,

allege for Arianism. Wherefore, I conclude, Protestantism is an unreasonable Nouelty, and consequently no Religion, for meely to Say à Religion is true, and from God, before it be made Credible by Supernatural Signes, Vphold's *Arianism*, *Arianism*, *Quakerism*, and the greatest fooleries in the world.

## CHAP. XVI.

*Objections solved. Sectaries pretending not to Se the Churches Evidence, are either blind, or wilfully shut their Eyes. The Assertion clearly proved. A Parallel of the Primitiue, and the present Churches Evidence. How far Reason may be sayd to Regulate Faith.*

**A**gainst our pleading Evidence of Credibility for Catholick Religion manifested by the Lustre of supernatural Motiues. One may first Obiect. Every Mans private Reason is to Iudge whether this Evidence Convinces, or no. And consequently the last Iudgement belong's to the Tribunal of priuate Reason. I haue Answered. The Evidence (vpon two rational Principles) is so great that it cannot but convince, First because the Author of it is no other but God, who certainly was no Impostor when he set before Reason the light of most glorious Supernatural Signes, And by virtue of them, hath induced both Jewes and Gentils to belieue in Christ. Because, That which the most Wise and Learned of the Christian world, haue Iudged *Evidently reasonable*, May vpon so great Authority, be supposed Reasonable. But All those Vast

*Why the Evidence of Credibility is most Convincing.*

*Two Reasons*

K k k k

Multiudes

Multitudes Converted to true Christian Religion, have Judged the Evidence of Credibility manifest in the Church, both rational and convincing, Therefore, it is so.

The Judgement long  
Since given,  
now is not  
reversible.

No other  
Inducements, extor-  
guable.

2. Hence it follows. 1. That the true Judgement concerning this Evidence, was long since given, antecedently to the weak Censure of this or that particular man, who now would Causil at it. 2. That all Exceptions made against it, are evidently vnreasonable vpon this ground, That those Thousands and Thousands most Wise and Learned, who owned the Evidence, And have been induced by it to believe, must (if Misled) be accounted not only temerarious, but also Mad, besotted, and grossly Seduced by Foolsies. This cannot be Granted. Perhaps you'll Say. Those Wise and Learned beliened vpon other Inducements, Distinct from our Churches Motiues. Answ. Not one can be Assigned distinct from these, if wee speak of Motiues *Proposed to Reason*, as is proued already.

Sectaries  
want not  
light, but  
Eye-sight

3. A. 2. Objection. Sectaries for all this, Pretend not to see the Churches Evidence. I Answer; it is not for want of *Light*, but for want of *Eye-sight*, That is, because they will be blind Thousands, As is now Said, as Wise and Learned as they, haue seen the Light and followed it, Why then do They stumble in Darkness, when the same Evidence is Set before their Eyes? I haue no other Answer, but what Truth it Self Delivers. *Iohn. 1. The Son of God, The Light of the world, now shineth vs, Et mundus cum non cognuit.* The world would not know him, Both Iewes and Gentils wilfully shut their Eyes, to the Signal Marks of his sacred Preaching, And so do Sectaries at this day, to the Churches Evidence.

They wilfully  
shut  
their Eyes.

4. Some may Reply. What we now Say, is only to Preach, and not to Proue. For how can wee Dittiee this Sectaries Shut their Eyes to any Light of Evidence? Answ. Enough is proued Already. Howener to come closer to the Matter, and to leave them without all excuse, I'll Add one word more, which shall be Conuincing.

5. Pray you Imagin, That some of our Sectaries had lived

in

In those happy Dayes, when the Holy Euangelists set forth the Life of our blessed Saviour, And the Apostles preached his Sacred Doctrin to the first Conuerted Christians: Would not They think ye, haue as readily believed what euer Doctrin those Blessed men then wrote, and Preach't, As the other vast Multitudes who came flocking in, believed? Yes Certainly, Their Obstinacy, though great; would not haue surpassed that of Iewes and Gentils, These yeilded, after they heard such Oracles speak, And so I think Sectaries would haue done also.

*An Argument drawn from the primitive Evidence.*

6. Now I Demand ( and the Question is very pertinent ) upon what Evidence of Credibility; By what prudential Motives laid forth to Reason, could These men ( had they then been in the world ) believed that *S. Matthew* ( for example ) wrote truly the Life, and Preached exactly the Doctrin of Iesus Christ? Did God Ascertain all men then liuing by priuate Reuelation, that the Euangelist was his Diuine Oracle? Or, did He openly proclaim that Verity to the world by an audible Voice, in the Aire? Was an Angel sent from Heauen to testify, that *a Matthew* deliuered Truth, and nothing but Truth? Or, was the Holy Ghost seen in any visible Form to suggest all He spoke and wrote, And to secure his tongue and hand from Errour in euery Syllable, in euery least Iota? No. Although God could haue done all this and more, yet wee read of no such Wonders.

*The Primitive Evidence of Credibility, was not, as some may imagine*

7. Say Therefore, Vpon what prudent Motiues, by what Evidence of Credibility would Sectaries, had they then liued, been Induced ( with Iewes and Gentils ) to belieue the Words and Writings of this one blessed Euangelist, or of any other infallible Oracle? The Gospel Answers. *Luk. 10. They went forth and preached euery where; Our Lord working with them, Confirming the Word with Signs which followed, And the Signs are known vnto all. They cast out Devils, raised the Dead, cured the Infirm, Suffered persecution, Conuerted Nations to the Faith of Christ; which was one, and perhaps not the least among their many other glorious Miracles. The great Apostle Heb. 2. 4. Speaks most significantly*

*The Primitive Evidence explained.*

K k k k a

significantly



ficantly this Sense. God withall assisting by Signes and Wonders, and diuers Miracles and Distributions of the Holy Ghost, according to his Will. Here we haue the Apostolical Euidence laid beforevs, And by it the Doctrin they taught made Credible to Reason. Hence I Argue.

*The Roman  
Catholick  
Church  
only. Shewes  
the like  
Euidence,*

*with an  
Aduantage.*

*Particulars  
insisted on.*

*strange Con-  
uersion.*

*Martyrdoms*

*Manifest in  
the Church.*

8. But most certainly the Roman Catholick Church, and no other Society, demonstrat's the very same Miracles, the very same Signes and wonders, not one Excepted, as is largely proued aboue, And to raise Her Glory aboue that, which a short time allowed not the primitiue Christians to Se, Hitherto neuer wanted the tryal of à 1671 years Persecution from Heathens, Turks, Heretiques, licentious Catholicks, and Diuels also, And yet, to Gods Glory be it, She keep's Her Posture Still, immoueable, Inuincible.

9. One word more. Had we liued in those happy Dayes, wee should haue seen or heard of à great Conuersion, wrought by our Sauour vpon one *Zachew*, à Principal Publican, à rich man, and à Sinner. A plain Miracle cries one of the Older Protestants, And therefore The Conuersion comes in with an *Ecce*. Behold the wonder. It this so? was it indeed à Miracle? *Ecce*. Behold Innumerable notorious Sinners, accustomed to vice Conuerted to the true Faith, and reclaimed from their lewdness by the incessant Labour of this one Roman Catholick Society.

10. Again, Had we liued in those Dayes, wee should haue seen or heard of à Courageous S. Stephen who sealed with his blood, that very Doctrin which the Euangelists wrote, And the Apostles afterward Preached, We should haue seen or heard how zealously the blessed man prayed for his merciless Persecutors, And from thence haue concluded, no other but God, gaue the Martyr that Courage to fight on to the end, and Charity to dye as Hee did most Gloriously. Here cast your thoughts again vpon the Roman Catholick Church in after Ages, and *Ecce*, Behold, for one S. Stephen you haue had Thousands armed with Courage, with Charity, and Constancy, who as be-  
hooued

wooded true Valiant Souldiers of Iesus Christ, stoutly shed their blood for that very Doctrin, She maintains at this day.

11. Thirdly, had you liued in those dayes, you would haue heard à new Doctrin preached contrary to corrupted nature, and the worlds Vanity, you would haue seen moreouer whole Multitudes of Conuerts, repaire to the Apostles, and cast their wealth down at their feet, calling nothing their own, but God only, who rich in Mercy was their Possession; And would you not haue Said, after to great à wonder, such Preachers were certainly inspired by the Holy Ghost to teach, And that those who complied with the Doctrin, were faithful Seruants of the most high God? None can doubt it. Now. *Esse*: Behold, the very same Learning is yet; and has been euer taught in the Roman Catholick Church, And to proue by real Effects, of what Power it is, Thousands, overflowing with worldly Fortune slighted all, and to contemn the Vanity retyred Themselues; Some into Desert places, others to the Solitude of Religious Cells, where rich in Virgine, they liued and dyed happily. Thus much, for à hint only.

*Contempt of the world in these Primitive times.*

*The like in the Church, at this day.*

12. Besides, wee haue in this ancient Mother Church, other great Aduantages of Holyness and Deuotion; answerable to the Practise of the Primitiue times. We want not those, who earnestly strue to obserue the highest Rules of perfection, and to follow the footsteps of the most blessed Saints, that now are glorious in Heauen. We want not Means to reclaim the most obdurate Sinners; and to help on aspiring Souls in the Exercise of mental Prayer, and Diuine Contemplation. We want not Doctrin worthy of God, set forth in the profound Mysteries of our Faith; nor à dutiful Submission to them by the greatest Capacities of the world. We want not our Fasts, our long Abstinences, and other Corporal Mortifications. Hard lodging, poor Fare, course Apparel, watchings, And the like medicinal Austerities weary not out; but proue

*More Advantages yet. Rules of Perfection.*

*Imitation of Saints. Means to reclaim sinners, Submission.*

K k k k 3

delight.

*Fasts and  
Austerities.*

delightful to Innumerable, that might have had both pleasure and plenty in a secular Condition.

*The Parallel  
Every way,  
Exact.*

13. By the little here briefly hinted at, you may learn (though a volume might be written of this Subject) How exactly the Roman Catholick keeps Parallel in every particular with that Primitive and most perfect Christian Society. The Evidence of Credibility is the very same in both Churches. The signatures of Divine Power and Wisdom, are no less illustrious in the Church at this Day, than when the Apostles preached.

*A most  
strong Argu-  
ment against*

14. Hence I Argue, And remind the Reader of my Proposition above, much to this sense. Sectaries either Se, or will not Se the Evidence of our Church Motives, already spoken of. These *Conversions*, these *Miracles*, These *Martyrdoms*, These *Austerities* &c. Appear to them no less clear Effects of Gods Divine Power now, than the very like Signatures or Motives appeared to the first Converted Christians, when the Apostles Preached. Say; They are no less clear, no less persuasive now, Sectaries are as much obliged to follow this light of Evidence, And to believe the Church, as they would have been obliged to believe the Apostles, Had they been Eye-witnesses of their Wonders, and heard them Preach. Say Contrary. The Evidence of Credibility seem's much abated, from what it was in those Primitive times, I'll first urge these Nouellists to giue a Disparity between that ancient Evidence, whereby Nations were Converted, And this we now plead for, And if none can be giuen (as manifestly there is none) I must conclude they are either blind and Se not, what the whole world has seen, Or which is a Truth, that they wilfully shut their Eyes, and vpon that Account are peruersly Obstinate.

*Sectaries Ob-  
stinate.*

*Gods Inten-  
tion was  
not, to delude  
any,*

15. Again, Because such Miracles, and those other Signes are manifest in the Roman Catholick Church, and in no other Society of Christians, I will Demand, what God (for they are the works of his own Power) intended by them? Was his meaning think ye, to foole the world? To delude poor  
Chri-

Cardians? To Contenance and Colour falshood, by His  
amirable Wonders? Most certainly, No. For, they ha-  
ve not only inclined, but obliged all to believe Christ's Doctrin  
under pain of damnation. Again, Truth it Selfe can oblige none  
to Err, The very light of nature teaches, there neuer was, nor  
will bee any necessity for God to work Miracles, in Confir-  
mation of Falshood, which He abhorrs, louing Truth for Truth,  
as well in others, as in Himselfe.

16. Some, who for stark Shame, cannot deny all our Churches  
Miracles, grant many, and withall Assent to the other  
great Motiues already Specified. Yet. 3. Obiect. None of  
them haue any necessary Connexion with Truth. I haue An-  
swered aboue. This Argument either destroies the first great  
Evidence of Christianity, manifest in our Saviours wonders and  
the Apostles, or becomes forceless. Besides, the Ground of it  
is null, For I haue proued already a necessary Connexion  
between a Real Miracle, and Truth, vpon this coniu-  
ning Principle. *True Miracles, as is now supposed, are, and haue  
been brought in the Church, and by no other but by the Infinitive  
Power of God (they surpass the force of Nature) Therefore Wit-  
ness it Selfe either deceiues, equivocates, and openly speaks  
worth, when He shewes these supernatural wonders, Or this  
evidence stands firm. A real Miracle and Truth are necessarily con-  
iunged.*

17. Others Argue. 4. And more impertinently. Were All  
that profess the Roman Catholick Religion, holy and virtuous,  
we might better plead for the Churches Evidence of Credibi-  
lity, But many, and very many are great Sinners, and this  
tends much to obfcurate Her Evidence. Now if we retort the  
Argument vpon Sectaries, and tell them also of their lewd Li-  
uers, that *Darken Prossion*, its easily replied, (and very truly)  
They haue no Evidence of Credibility to Obfcurate. There-  
fore We, who certainly haue it, and not They, are obliged  
to solve the Obiection. Answ. That's quickly don. And to  
direct it, I am once more to lead our Nouelists to those hap-

By His ad-  
mirable  
Wonders.

He loves  
truth for  
truth.

The ground  
of this Obie-  
ction, worth  
nothing.

Real Miracles  
clearly  
truth.

Whether sin  
and sinners  
can obfcurate  
the Evidence  
of Credibili-  
ty?

py.

*The Answer  
is negative,  
and*

*Proved by  
many Exam-  
ples in the  
Primitive ti-  
mes.*

*Sin Eclypses  
not*

*The resul-  
tant sign of  
power and  
Wisdom.*

*Another Ob-  
jection*

py Dayes of the Primitive Age, and Demand, Whether all then were Saints? No certainly. We read of a wicked Judas, who betrayed his Master, Christ our Lord. Say I beseech you, would that have extinguished the lustre of Christs Glorious Miracles, or withdrawn them from belieuing in the true Messias? We Read also of a couetous *Demas* that abandoned S. Paul, and returned to the world. *Demas me reliquit, diligens hoc seculum*, would his bad Example haue obscured the Apostles Wonders, or made the Beliefe of His Doctrin, less firm? Finally we read of an incestuous Corinthian, infamous for Luxury, would Sectaries think ye therevpon, haue been dismayed, or giuen ouer the Practise of Virtue, because he was naught? Not at all. For if Wise, they know, that Cockle and Wheat grow vp together in the same large field of the Church, and it will be so (the Gospel is my warrant) vntil the Haruest, makes the separation. Say then, did those *Judas's*, those *Demas's*, those *Incontinent Liuers* dishearten any, or Eclyps in the least that Apostolical Euidence We speak of, when vast Multitudes were found faithful and eminently virtuous? You will Answer No. Why therefore should lewd Liuers at this day, Eclyps, or discountenance the Glorious Euidence of the *Roman Catholick Church*, whilst we find in it, Innumerable iust, Innumerable strong in Faith, confident in Hope, Zealous in Charity, And moreouer, which is euer to be noted, behold to our great Comfort, Gods own illustrious Signatures most apparent Age after Age, in this one Blessed Society of Christians?

18. Some to Oppose what we said aboue, Object in the 5. Place. The Church cannot be according to the Principles of a Catholick the Rule of Faith, But contrarywise, the Catholicks own *internal Iudgement* of Reason, must regulate, For this makes the best Catholicks in the world, to belieue the Church. If you will haue a Proof Hereof: Ask any knowing Orthodox Christian, Why he hold's the Church His Rule of Faith, He cannot Answer, because He belieues so, but will presently tell you, He is assured of that truth by prudent Reason. *Ans.*  
No

No man, whether Sectary or Catholick, can make his own internal Judgement, though fancied reasonable à hundred times over, the Rule of Faith, Vnless more bee added. Now If you enquire after what I expresse by this word. *More*? I Answer. It implies an *Obiective Evidence*, set before every rational vnderstanding which laid hold on, makes à the Judgement Reasonable, without this Obiective Light, or Evidence, every condemned Heretick, may nickname things, and call his own fancy Reasonable, though He hath nothing like à rational Motiue to settle it vpon. This is the main thing to be noted, in our present contro-  
uerty.

*Pretended Reason, without rational Evidence, no Rule of Faith.*

19. Now here is the whole Contest between vs and Sectaries. We ground our Judgement of Credibility vpon such an Evidence of Motiues as Conuerted the world, We say, An Infinite Goodnes cannot permit the world to be led into Error, by Evident Miracles, evident Conversions, and other both Signal, and Supernatural Wonders. All this is Reason, and vndeniable reason, The Signs are Manifest, Sensible, and Visible. In the next place, We vrge Sectaries to speak in behalfe of Protestancy, or to giue in the like Evidence for that Nouelty? They recoyle, draw back, and talk (tis true) of Reason, but turn vs off with the bare word alone, hauing no obiective Evidence to ground à rational Judgement vpon. I speak truth, And will defend it. No more can these men, if you set aside A selfe-wilful Perswasion, satisfy Reason why they belieue as they doe, then the worst of Arians tell you, why they belieue Arianism.

*The Catholicks rational Evidence grounded.*

*Sectaries haue none at all.*

20. It would bee ridiculous in this contest, to bring in Scripture as à Rule of their Faith. For first we here enquire not after the Obiect of their Belief, But call for rational Motiues, whereby they are induced to belieue Protestancy. We Say, Though Scripture were in à General way owned The most immediate Rule, and the Sense of it could bee known by the priuate Reason of some men in the world, yet The Sectary gain's nothing vpon the Concession, because He knows

*Scripture here is not pleadable.*



*The Reason.* not, nor shall ever know upon any sure Principle, That his Reason hath the singular Priviledge to hit right on the Scriptures true Sense, whilst all His Aduersaries ( and they are very many ) openly oppose it, as improbable.

*If the protestants do strain from what Doctrine be likes not.* 21. One may yet reply. For as much as The Sectary Belieues, which is not much ( For it lies in à few Fundamentals ) He has the same Evidence of Credibility as we Catholicks have, And so far joyn's with vs in Beliefe : In other Matters of Contest, He neither Belieues, nor Disbelieues, but Abstract's from all. Contra. 1. Thus the Arians and all Heretiques proceed, who first chuse, and lay claim to so many Tenets of Christian Doctrin as pleases Fancy, and then tell vs, They haue Reason to chuse, to Divide, and separate from the rest. We demand ( and here is the main Point ) what rational Evidence haue they to do so? Who made Beggars ( For all they haue, they took from the Church ) such bold Chusers? Again, if they prescind or abstract, They are obliged to Design an evidenced Orthodox Church, which abstracted like them, and positively taught so much Doctrin is precisely necessary to Salvation, And no more. This is impossible. O yes, The Primitive Church seem's to haue abstracted from many Doctrins now taught by the Roman Catholick. Contra. Who tell's you so? Your lame Negative way of Arguing? *We read not of Purgatory, nor of Transubstantiation &c.* Pitiful. The evidenced Roman Catholick Church by Her Constant Tradition speak's of both, and also positively avouches, that all now taught, was then Anciently deliuered, Here is our Principle, and wee vrge Sectaries to oppose it by producing the Authority of another more ancient Church, which Spake then, as they speak now, Or which abstracted from such Particular Doctrins, as they would abstract from. But this is Impossible. Out of all I Conclude, Sectaries haue no Evidence of Credibility for any Doctrin believed by them, and Consequently no true Faith at all, but Opinions only, and those false too. Now we must solve two or three difficulties of another Nature.

*why may not the Arians do the like?*

*No Church fauours this Doctrin.*

*Sectaries vrge to name the Orthodox Church, which abstracted as they do.*

12. A. 6. Objection. Reason Assures the Catholick, that God speak's by the Oracle of the Church. *Ergo*, his Faith is ultimately resolved into Reason. I Deny the Consequence; For if wee make a right Analysis, The Act of Faith is not yet in Being, in that Sign, or Priority of Nature, when Prudence tell's Him. *God speak's by the Church.* The nature of that Judgement, serves only to induce the vnderstanding to Faith, or to fix it vpon an vnvariable state of Believing, And consequently must be resolved, into its own clear Principles, *presumably penetrated*, before the Catholick belieues. Faith followes, and relies immediatly vpon its own Obiect, which is God's Revelation proposed by the Church, or by Scripture infallibly interpreted. Now,

*Another Objection.*

13. If you Obiect. 7. It is my priuate Reason which makes me to belieue the Church. I Answer. The Proposition is equiuocal, For it may either signify, what I call Reason independently of all known *Obiectiue Euidence*, makes mee to belieue the Church, And that Sense is very false, Nay its impossible, to hold euery internal Act, not resoluable into *Obiectiue Euidence* in a matter of such Consequence, *Reasonable*. This as I said aboue Patronises the worst of Heresies, and Atheism also.

*The equiuocation discerned.*

*One sense false.*

14. Or Contrarywise, the Sense may be. The Church gloriously marked by clear and Conuincing Motiues, *known*, and *applied* by my formal Act of Reason, makes it *Reasonable*, and that's most true. Wherefore, euery rational Judgement in the present matter, must be fixed vpon rational prudent Motiues, *distinct from the Act we iudge by*. The Judgement is no more but *Condition applicans*, a Condition, whereby the *Obiectiue Euidence* is laid hold on, and set before an Vnderstanding. The Ground hereof is clear, For we know not by *Obiects* extrinseck to our Knowledge, but by vital Acts which interuene between the Intellectual Power, and *Obiects*. Now if any Ask, why may not this Judgement mistake and erre? I Answer first, by Proposing the like Question. Why might not the Judgement of the Primitive Christians, when they saw or heard of the Apostles

*The other true, when the judgement is grounded on rational Euidence*

*Why this  
Judgement  
cannot be  
erroneous,*

great Wonders, have also been à Mistake or Errour? Solve the one, you solve the other. I Answer 2. The Judgement cannot (if it pitch vpon what really is the *Obiective Evidence*) be Erroneous, For no fundation of Errour, as wee now Suppose, Lies there; Therefore, none can be deriued from thence into any understanding. *A pure fountain yields no puddled water.*

*Faith Consi-  
dered two  
wayes.*

*As prudent,  
how it is  
resolved.*

*The resolu-  
tion of her-  
wise, if con-  
sidered as  
it relies vpon  
the Diuine  
Testimony.*

25. A. 8. Obiection. Faith is an Act of a reasonable power, and consequently Conformable to Reason; Therefore, Reason regulates Faith, or is its immediate Rule. Answ. The Act of Faith may be Considered two wayes. First, as it is a prudent reasonable Submission to Gods Reuelation. 2. As its terminated vpon the Reuelation proposed by the Church, or any other infallible evidenced Oracle. Consider it vnder the First Notion of a prudent Submission, it euer Implies, or rather presupposeth, the rational prudent Iudgement now mentioned, And this Iudgement preuiously set fast vpon such Motiues, as conuerted the world, may well be Said to denominate, the Act of elicit Faith, à *rational Obsequiousness*, Yea, and its extrinsecal Rule also, as will appear to euery one, that makes à right *Analysis*, or brings Faith to its last Principles. But consider again the very Act, it Selfe, or precisely as it tend's vpon the Diuine Reuelation proposed by an Infallible Oracle, it *reason's* not at all, nor more proues, or Scientifically *knows* its Obiect (*as Faith*) Than Science as Science believes. This *Proves* that submissiuely *Believes*. Nor can Faith, which euer presupposes its Obiect and Rule proued to Reason, Scientifically, proue either, without losing what is Essential to it, I mean *Obscurity*. Se more hereof in the other Treatise. Disc. 1. C. 5. n. 13. 14.

*Particular  
Controuer-  
sies exami-  
ned by this  
and that  
particular  
Authority*

26. By all hitherto Said: you se, How the Priuate Reason of this or that Man may more easily swerue, or lose the right way of Arguing, when a Dispute is held vpon particular Controuersies, then when its brought to the Censure and easy Tryal of an evidenced Church. This Oracle Speaks clearly, Whereas, if the debate be of particular Points examined by Scripture, or Authority,

Authority; We find by experience that two Aduersaries seldom or neuer agree vpon the Sense of those very Authorities, they would haue Matters decided by.

not easily  
ended

17. You se. 2. The Summ of all handled in this Chapter to be as follows. The Catholick hold's his Faith infallible, which essentially relies vpon a Reuelation *Diuine*, and *Infallible*. Now because God proposes not by Himselfe or immediatly His own sacred Doctrin to Euery faithful Belieuer in particular, He hath established a Church, and made Her an Oracle to speak in His name. She comes as it were, between God and Belieuers; And conueyes vnto vs the true Diuine Doctrin of the first *reuealing Verity*. Now because, She is an Oracle immediately Credible by Supernatural Signs, which an Infinite Power and Wisdom Demonstrates, We Iustly call Her the Infallible Rule. Though Scripture faithfully interpreted, be our Rule also, but not to *immediatly Credible*. The Church once discouered, by the Euidence of an Assent grounded on *convincing Motiues*, Regulates Faith, plain Reason preuiously resting vpon those Motiues, tell's us God speak's by Her. Here we rest, by this Rule we are guided.

The summe  
of all his here  
to handled,

briefly hin-  
ted at

18. Hence you se. 3. Whoeuer dépriues the Church of her Lustre and Signal Wonders ( manifest to Reason ) makes her Doctrin, and the very Scriptures also not worthy Beliefe, dead's Faith, Eclipses Gods reuealed Truths, and doth the utmost to bring in Atheism. In a word He makes Christian Religion vnreasonable, which is vtterly to Destroy it. what I say seem's manifest. For Suppose, we had, had no Miracles since the Apostles times, no Succession of Commissioned Pastors, no further Conuerfions of Nations. No more eminent Sanctity in this great Moral Body, after that first Age; No Martyrdoins, no Generous contempt of the world. Who I beseech you would, or Could haue certainly believed, either the Sacred Trinity; or the great Mystery of the Word Incarnate, vpon the bare report of a few fallible vncommissioned Men or woemen, that might Perhaps haue Spoken ( and

It Consequen-  
ces  
follow, the  
Denial of  
Church  
Motiues.

*The world,  
not with  
standing  
most glorious  
Mysteries  
Shewn, is  
much incred-  
ulous,*

*without  
them, would  
have not be-  
lieved any  
thing.*

*The sin of  
Sectaries.*

*Evidence of  
Credibility  
not separa-  
ble from true  
Religion.*

Perhaps not) of these, and other sublime Mysteries, but without rational Motives. Appeal now boldly to the Tribunal of Reason, and Ask, whether such a Doctrine, appears not to all Prudent men more than improbable? Whilst experience teaches; that a great Part of the world both now, and in former Ages also (though the Church ever shewed Her Selfe the only glorious evidenced Oracle) remain's notwithstanding in a State of Incredulity. What then would so many Nations have done? How cold would Their Faith have been? Who would have believed, had all the After-Motives of Faith perished, and nothing been heard of but high Mysteries mentioned, without supernatural Signs Confirming the Doctrine, In a word without all Evidence of Credibility? Hence,

29. You Se. 4. The hideous sin of Sectaries, who do not only rob the Church of her Glorious Marks manifested to Reason, and so make Her Doctrine and whatever Scripture teaches, incredible; But to ruin all, They will have the Mysteries of our Faith talk't of, but not one Taught Infallibly, And thereby destroy Faith it Selfe. Thus Reason and Religion go to wrack at once.

30. You Se. 5. It is impossible without subverting Christianity, to Separate the evidence of Credibility grounded on Convincing Motives, from true Christian Religion. Wherefore I conclude, That as God has ever hitherto, assisted the Orthodox Church to Teach Truth, So also he has, and will preserve in Her the evidence of Credibility, whereby all Rational men may find truth, And indubitably Assert. *This and no other, is the Society of Christians, which teaches God's revealed Verities,* and can best inform vs of every Doctrine the Church taught in foregoing Ages.

CHAP. XVII.

*A Digression Concerning Doctor Stillingsfleets Discourse  
Where he treat's of the Protestants Faith redu-  
ced to Principles. He is all a long quite  
besides the matter handled, and Sayes no  
more for Protestancy, than for Aria-  
nism, or any other Heresy.*

**N**OW Courteous Reader, that when this Treatise was vnder the Press and towards an end, there came now very lately to my hands A Discourse concerning the Idolatry practised in the Church of Rome. A stale worn-out Cattel, by Edward Stillingsfleet D. D. Doctor, as I interpret, of Divinity, though in his Account he was only B. D. and therefore, hitherto named by me plain Mr Stillingsfleet. The fault (if any) is easily amended, He shall haue his due hereafter, and be called Doctor. In this Discourse, which very candidly I haue not read, nor I belieue euer shall; For the matter appears very triuial, and look's like a Rapsodie, I find towards the end of it a Flurt, and no more, at a Book Intituled *Hussians, Without Principles*. I know, Saith he, no other Answer necessary, not only to this present demand, but to a Book called *Protestants Without Principles*, the falsity of which, Will appear by what follows.

*The Occasion  
of writing  
this Chapter*

*The Doctors  
quick Dis-  
patch,  
Like one  
Loath'd to en-  
gage.*

You may well imagin, I hasten'd to this. What Follows. And saw in the next Page, Six Principles agreed on by both Sides. 1. That there is a God, from Whom Man and all other Creatures had their Being. 2. That the Notion of God doth im-  
ply.



*Six Principles, removed from Protestantly.*

ply, that he is à Bring absolutely perfect. 3. That man receiving his Being from God, is thereby bound to obey his will, and so on to the Sixt, which, Methought, seem'd as remote from Principling the Protestants Faith, as if he had told vs. Adam was tempted by Eue.

3. The next Leaf turned ouer; I found this Title, Contrary to *Protestancy without Principles*. The Faith of Protestants reduced to Principles, with this Addition. These things (viz. The six Principles) being agreed on both Sides, We are now to inquire into the particular ways which God has made choice of for revealing his Will to Mankind. He should also haue said. And Concerning the Faith of Protestants (here lies the main Buſines) if mankind be concerned in it, but this is waived.

*A promising Title. But the main matter is waived,*

*Particulars omitted,*

*The pretended Faith of Protestants Cannot be known. All may assure that Faith without danger of Salvation.*

4. Nay more is waived, whereon all depend's. Obserue I beseech you. We haue here à fair Title. *The Protestants faith reduced to Principles*, before we know what these men believe. Yet most certainly, we should first haue had some light concerning their Beliefe, before we hear talk of its Principles. We should know how many Articles the Professors of it maintain as necessary to saluation, How many also they reject as Heretical? We should know what it is, one may boldly renounce as an Opinion, proper to Protestants; And what it is he must hold, as Protestant, or be damned? All this I Say and more, Should in the first place haue been fully explained, to the end we may haue some hint of the Thing Principled, before we are informed of its Principles. The Proof of à Thesis euer presupposes the Thesis plainly set down. You neuer heard of any Tenet publickly exposed in Schools, to the Examination of others, But euery Opponent knowes, what's Asserted. All here run's in à contrary Strain. A Faith is spoken of reducible to Principles, which is so remote from all humane vnderstanding, that none shall, or can euer tell me, what it is. Or speak thus, And you speak truth. *VPon what euer the Protestants maintain's* (as he is Protestant) *though called Faith, may, without danger of our Souls, be boldly renounced by him,*

by

by me, and the whole World besides. I shall to this end draw  
 5. The Convincing Reason of what I now Assert, is fo-  
 groundedly laid forth in this present Treatise, that no Secta-  
 ry shall overthrow our Proofs. Read I beseech you, The 1.  
 Disc. C. 20. n. 7. and what followes, you find there a Sect  
 of men called Protestants, but without the very Essence of Re-  
 ligion. Read also the. 2. Discourse, you have there in sever-  
 al places, the whole Faith of Protestants brought to a List  
 of meer false Opinions, or rather to flat Heresies. Their  
 negative Articles, of not Praying to Saints! Of no Transubstan-  
 tiation are cashiered by them. The Doctrine common to all called  
 Christians, without more, is a plain Fourth, unless they deny  
 the sacred Mysteries of the Trinity and Incarnation also, with  
 Arians. Their Pretence to believe so much of Catholick Do-  
 ctain as pleases their Fancies, is not singular to them, but  
 common to others, no Protestants.

They have  
no Essence of  
Religion.

Their Nega-  
tives, dispo-  
sed, and  
Deduced  
Common to  
all Insuffi-  
cient.

6. Now (and its ever to be noted) we enquire after the  
 singular Faith of Protestants as contradistinct from Popery. And  
 all other known Heresies, And desire, That this Faith as it  
 is Peculiar, may be reduced to Principles? I Say the Reduc-  
 tion is utterly impossible, and the Reason is best expressed  
 in few words. Their Faith is Phansy, They have nothing like Faith  
 to stand on Principles. But to see this proved, You are once  
 more wished, to read the Discourses and Chapters already quot-  
 ed, for I will not take so much pains for the Doctor as meer-  
 ly to blot Paper, and repeat in this place, what is there Con-  
 vinct. Thus much Noted.

Where the  
main diffi-  
culty is? And  
what should  
be answer-  
ed?

7. Be pleased to hear two Propositions, which come neerer  
 to our present matter. One is. *Whatevcr Faith the Sectary  
 like claim to, as peculiar to Protestantcy (be it what you will) is  
 contrary to the received Doctrine of the Roman Catholick Church,  
 is not reducible to Principles.*

Two Propo-  
sitions.

2. Another Assertion. All the Principles, tediously made vfo-  
 of by the Doctor (we may Suppose him very conscientious in  
 the best) are wholly impertinent, And have no more to doe  
 with

M m m m

with

# 642 Disc 3. C 17. The Protestants Faith, nor

with the Faith of Protestants; No more support that Novelty, then if one should tell you. *Abraham begs Isaac.* If I proue this, you'll Say, the Doctor has ventured vpon a desperat Attempt; If not; I disgrace my selfe.

*The Doctrin contained in these Principles,*

*And the Application, are to be distinguished.*

*The first Principle.*

*A more parergon, so the present Controversy.*

*The reason, why it is impertinent.*

9. To goe on and proue. We must first well distinguish between the Doctrin contained in these Principles, supposed to uphold the Protestants Faith, and the Application or Inferences drawn from it, in order to that end. The Doctrin is sometimes true, sometimes false; and often (not well expressed) dubious. But the Application of it to Protestancy, And this most Concern's the Doctor, *when true*, is as remote from the purpose, or no more Concern's the faith of Protestants, then if one should Say. *God made the World*, I say *when is true*, for if false or dubious, its wholly impertinent.

10. Thus the Doctor begins. (and pity me that I trouble the Reader, and my Selfe also with meer Parergons, which relate not at all to Protestancy.) First. *An entire Obedience to the Will of God being agreed on to be the condition of Mans happines, no other Way is in it selfe necessary to that end, than such, whereby Man may know what the Will of God is.* Answ. This general Doctrin, though true, Support's no more the particular faith of Protestants (be it what you will) then the Faith of Arians, or Pelagians. For all these and Catholicks likewise, may grant. *There is no other Way necessary to happines than such, whereby a Man may know what the Will of God is*, yet must withall acknowledge the Inference, the Reduction, or Application to this *or that particular Doctrin*, wherein these Parties dissent from one another; wholly impertinent, vnless more be Sayd. For Example, the worst of Heretiques hold with Catholicks. There is no other way to be saued but by Christ Iesus our Redeemer, But as the Arian neuer offers, immediatly to draw from thence his Denyal of a Mysterious Trinity, So the Catholick would be as far to seek, should he aduenture, *without more*, to build the Infallibility of the Church, or the Doctrin of Transubstantiation vpon that General agreed Truth only. The Reason is. A Principle Common

mon to all, or more, Considered as *Common*, stand's firm, gives light, 'Tis true, so far as it reaches, but cannot possibly extend to selfe, to all the different Tenets Wherevpon Men fall, when they vary and dissent among Themselves. Here the Principle becomes vfeless without more light, or a new Supply of other *proofs*, which relate immediatly to euery particular Doctrin, really true, or pretended to be so.

11. Thus you Se the Doctors errour, whilst first he gives you a Principle common to all, And will next build the particular Faith of Protestants vpon it. I Say this is impossible, For a truth so General, (as is now noted) gives no more Support, or Light to Protestancy, than to Arianism. Had the D<sup>r</sup> better explained these General words. *There is no other way than such, whereby Man may know what the Will of God is*, And then adioyned. *But Protestants in behalf of their new Faith, Teach and Proue such* to be the only only wayes, whereby Man may know the Will of God, and Papists cannot doe it; He had offered at something, But in doing so, He would First haue receded from the General true Principle, And next haue spoken a loud vntruth, because Protestants haue no such wayes. Now only to tell vs, what all the world knowes, and to make that a Principle for Protestancy, is certainly more then a strange Impertinency. Yet this Strain run's through all his other mis-called Principles.

12. Obserue it in the three following Paragraphs. *Man*, Saith He, being framed a rational creature may Antecedently to any external Reuelation certainly know the Being of God, and his dependency vpon him. What's this to the Purpose? All is true, but the Truth is so General, that it reaches not at all to the Protestants particular Faith. No more doe the other two which follow immediatly, as euery Reader will easily perceiue, at the first view.

13. Perhaps the Fifth in order may proue better. *There can be no other means Imagined whereby we are to Iudge of the truth of Diuine Reuelation, but a faculty in vs of discerning truth and falshood*

*The Doctors  
errour.*

*No applica-  
tion made of  
the general  
Principle.*

*The want of  
Applications  
hold's on*

# 644 Dile. 3. C. 17. The Protestants Faith, not

Another  
Principle  
promis-  
ing,  
Vnles Secta-  
ries suppose  
themselves,  
the only  
opposite ind-  
ga.

in matters proposed to our beliefs, which if we doe not exercise in iud-  
ging the truth of Divine Reuelation we must be imposed vpon, by any  
thing that pretend's to be so. The Assertion Still too Gene-  
ral Euinces nothing for Protestancy, Vnles these words (if we  
do not Exercise). (VVe must be imposed vpon) Signify that Pro-  
testants only are to Iudge, excluding others, both Catholicks  
and all called Christians. Say that Protestants only can iudge,  
you speak à Paradox. Allow others à Faculty in Iudging,  
the Question will be who Iudges best? Which is far from  
being decided by this abstract Principle, Therefore as its worth  
nothing, it concludes Nothing, without à further Application.  
Now if you desire to Se how Reason proceed's in Iudging  
of Religion, Read the. 3. Discourse. C. 15.

The Doctor  
speaks of à  
way, but  
tells vs not,

14. The sixth Way or Principle. The Pretence of Infallibi-  
lity in any Person, or Society of Men, must be Iudged in the same Way,  
and by the same means that the truth of à Reuelation is. Say good  
Reader, who can know what to do by force of These Ge-  
neral Terms, whilst neither Way nor Means in particular, are  
so much as hinted at? The Arian takes his way, The Pro-  
testant another, the Catholick proceeds contrary to both.  
Therefore vnles the Doctor can proue that Protestants take  
the right Way, and All the rest of Christians doe not (and it  
must be proued by à Principle distinct from this General one)  
He abuses the Reader, and will seem to speak in behalf of  
the Protestants Faith, though he comes not neer it.

The 7th.  
Principle as  
bad, as the  
6th,

15. The. 7th. Principle. It being in the Power of God to ma-  
ke choice of seueral Wayes of reuealing his Will, we ought to enquire  
What Way God has chosen? Answ. Once more who are these.  
We, that ought to enquire? What, Protestants only? Haue  
not others before Sectaries were born, both sought and found  
the true way to Saluation? But let this pass. The Principle  
too General concern's not Protestants at all, before it be shewn  
vpon better Proofs, that they only haue hit on the right way,  
which neither is proued, nor can be made probable.

16. The. 8th. and 9th. Principles only fill Paper, and concern  
not

the matter now in hand. In the 10<sup>th</sup>. we are told, that God can as well declare his Will by Writing, as by men *infallibly* *spoke*. Answ. All grant God can clearly declare his mind in Writing, But the Question is, whether this be done *de Facto*, in the Holy Book of Scripture? S. Peter cited above, Says so. However, suppose it done, A second Question followes, and Tis à hard one. Viz. Whether that singular Priuiledge of vnderstanding Gods declared Will, expressed in Scripture, can be granted Protestants, before all others called Christians, and particularly before their Elder Brethren, the Roman Catholics? Affirm, The Paradox must be euinced by à stronge Proof in deed. Say No; or grant that others besides Protestants may as well vnderstand it, as They, The Principle no more Concern's them, them the rest of mankind. And thus you Se, The Application of all true Principles to Protestancy, euer Fail's, and Cannot but faile.

*Sellarius ha-  
us not the  
singular gra-  
ty, to vnder-  
stand Scrip-  
ture before  
all others.*

17. The 11<sup>th</sup>. Principle is true, But touches Protestants no more, then other Christians. The 12<sup>th</sup>. Where t'is Sayd, We are to Iudge by those writings. (of Scripture) *what the will of God is in order to Salvation*, is no Principle, but à false Supposition, in case the Authority and infallible Interpretation of the Church, be reiected. But grant all. Ask again, who are those, We, that must Iudge? What Protestants only? Or others with them? If all may Iudge, and differ, as is most euident, in the highest matters of Faith after the perusal of Scripture, A new Question ensues; Whose iudgement is finally to be stood to, which shall neuer be decided without introducing another Principle, whereby all must say. *Such an Oracle Iudges for all.*

*An vntrue  
Supposition.*

*What follo-  
wes, if all  
dissenting  
in the high  
matters of  
Faith, may  
Iudge?*

18. Hence I briefly Answer to 13<sup>th</sup>. and 15<sup>th</sup>. Principles (The 14<sup>th</sup>. is à meer Parergon) In the first we are told. *It is repugnant to the Designe, to the Wisdom and Goodnes of God, to giue infallible Assurance to Persons in Writing his Will, for the benefice of Mankind, if those Writings may not be vnderstood by all persons who sincerely endeavour to know the meaning of them, in such things as are necessary* M m m m. 3

for



646 Disc. 3. C. 17. *The Protestants Faith, not*

*Who are the  
Sincere  
Seekers,*

*Still want  
of Applica-  
tion*

*Evidenced  
by this one  
Syllogism-*

for their Salvation. Answ. And mark, How remote we are yet from Protestancy? Grant those writings may be vnderstood by all who take the right Way, and endeavour to know their meaning, Nothing followes, whilst the Doctor proues not by another distinct Principle, that Protestants only are the sincere Inquirers, excluding others, who after all endeavour vsed, Dissent from them. This not done, he turn's vs off with à general Proposition, making no Application of it to his own particular Cause. You will Se what I would Say, by this one Syllogism. Those writings may be vnderstood by all who take the right way, and endeavour to know their meaning, But Protestants do this, and Papists do not. Here the Minor is evidently dubious ( I say absolutely false ) and therefore the Application of the general Principle to Protestants, fail's, But this failing, or not applied home by another Proof; The general Proposition no more Supports Protestancy, then *Arianism* or *Pelagianism*. Of this want of application which transcend's all the Doctors Principles, when true, you shall haue more presently.

*An Vntruth.  
Supposed.*

*Though the  
Assertion  
were suppo-  
sed true, is  
help: not  
Protestants.*

19. In the mean while take notice of it again in the 15<sup>th</sup> Way. These Writings being owned as Containing in them the whole Will of God so plainly reuealed, that no sober Enquirer can miss of what is necessary for Salvation, There can be &c. First its false, that the whole Will of God, is plainly reuealed in Scripture. And had we no more, but Thus much only. Viz. The vast multitudes of Christians who zealously defend that sense they Conceiue of Scripture, yet contradict one another in Points most Essential, Proues it false, whereof enough is said in the seueral parts of this Treatise. But let that Pass. Suppose it à Truth The Propositions or Proofs must run thus. No sober Enquirer can miss of knowing God's Will, or of what is necessary to Salvation. Now add this Minor. But the Protestant only, is the sober Enquirer, For No Arian, No Pelagian, No Quaker, No Papist soberly enquires, excepting the Protestant. Thus much must be Assumed or to the General Proposition Vnappplied, help's the Protestant no more then others, that execrate his Doctrin; For if these

or

or any of them, may be listed among the number of sober Enquirers (its ridiculous to exclude all) and yet reject Protestantism. The general Proposition (for ought appears yet) may be applyed as well by every one to his particular Religion, as by the Protestants, to *Protestancy*. Therefore it signifies Iust Nothing, before a right Application be made by distinct Proofs, to the One only true Religion. Some may reply every Man is to enquire, and Answer for Himselfe. Pitiful That's to Say, we must alwaies be Scepticks, euer learning and neuer well taught. Weak reason and fancy are thus made our Doctors, if this Principle be owned. Se Disc. 2. C. 17. *Per totum*. In the *Interim* know, this long inquiring after one whole Age, brings no vnion in faith to Protestants, who are as the world Sees, at endless Iarres amongst themselues.

20. The 16<sup>th</sup> Principle Opposes such Men as pretend to infallible Assistance, without giuing an equal degree of Euidence, that they are so assisted as Christ and his Apostles did, by Miracles as great, as publick and conuincing, as these were. Answ. This Principle is quite besides the matter. First, because Protestants own a Church infallible in Fundamentals, without giuing an Euidence equal to that of Christ and his Apostles. Why then may not such an Euidence as proues the Church Infallible in Fundamentals, be further extended, and induce All to belieue Her Infallible, in every Doctrin She teaches. 2. The Principle is false. We haue Apostolical Euidence in the Church euer since those Primitiue times, as is largely proued Disc. 1. C. 14. 15. 16. And Disc. 3. C. 3. Lastly it is no more but a Prooffes Assertion against the Church, which laies claim to Infallibility, And cannot though it were true, aduantage Protestancy one whit. Please to obserue my Reason. Suppose the Catholick Church, and the Protestant party were like one another, equally fallible, vpon what Principle can the fallible Protestant Party plead better, or Say more for his Cause, then the supposed fallible Roman Church in behalfe of Her Doctrin? Both of them, as is proued in the second Discourse, would in this case,

*The Reason  
hereof.*

*Se<sup>th</sup>aries  
after this  
long Enquiry  
haue no  
Vnion in  
Faith.*

*This Principle  
is first  
against  
Protestants.*

*Secondly,  
false.*

*Thirdly,  
though Sup-  
posed true,  
is help's not  
Protestants.*

648 Disc. 3. C. 17. *The protestants Faith, not*

*There is no  
hereof  
Convinces.*

case, be à Publick scorn to Jewes and Gentils, whilst they Out-braue one another, with the *New Nothing* of fallible Principles, And (which is euer to be noted) can stand on no surer Ground then what is fallible, and may be false, if no Church be owned Infallible.

*Nothing yet  
for Proto-  
stancy*

21. In the. 17<sup>th</sup> Principle we are told its absurd, to pretend the necessity of an Infallible Assistance, to assure vs of the truth of Scripture, And at the same time to Proue the Assistance from those writings, from which nothing can be certainly deduced. Answ. Here again is nothing for Protestancy. For Suppose which is false; we proue not an Infallible Assistance, Are therefore Protestants in à better condition then Catholicks? But to speak truth, the Doctor wholly Mistakes, we proue the Churches Infallibility independently of Scripture. Read Disc. 3. C. 5. In the. 18. Principle we hear talk again of the best Means for vnderstanding the Scripture, but whether we Catholicks, Arians or Protestants happily light on't, is not so much as hinted at by the Doctor, wherefore I Said aboue, these Generalities proue nothing, without à nearer Application, made by Proofs, yet more immediate.

*How The  
Churches  
Infallibility  
is first  
Proued.*

22. The. 19<sup>th</sup> Principle. *The Assistance which God hath promised to those who sincerely desire to know his Will, may give them greater Assurance of the truth of what is contained in Scripture, than it is possible for the greatest infallibility in any other person to doe* Supposing they haue not such assurance of their Infallibility. Answ. All this (were it true) is to say lust nothing concerning Protestants, vnless they be supposed the only Men. who sincerely desire to know Gods Will, for if any other called Christians of à different Beliefe, be as Sober Inquirers, or desire as earnestly to know Gods vwill, as Sectaries, What gain they by this remote abstract Principle? Now to Suppose all other Christians negligent, in the Inquiry after Gods will, and Protestants only the zealous Seekers, comes nearer to à bold Presumption; than to any thing like the nature of à Principle. In à word here you haue all, The Application to the Protestant Faith

*Sectaries  
gain nothing  
by this ab-  
stract Prin-  
ciple.*

Faith is wanting. But what will you? The Doctor cannot be drawn to plead for his own cause. Finally, sense is wanting in that last clause. *Supposing they have not such assurance of their Infallibility.* Which is only to Say. *Supposing the Church be not Infallible, Catholics cannot believe Her Infallibility.*

*Unless they  
Suppose  
Themselves,  
themselves sober  
Inquirers,  
Want of  
Sense.*

23. The 20<sup>th</sup> Principle. *No Mans Faith can therefore be infallible, merely because the Proponent is said to be Infallible.* Answ. But if the Proponent be both *Said*, and *Proued* Infallible (and this is simply proued) Faith with the Assistance of God's Grace may well, yea and must depend vpon it, and be infallible. However, let all here *Said* pass. There is yet nothing drawn from the Principle more concerning the Faith of *Protestants* then of the *Arians*. Obserue well. Both hold the Proponent of Faith which is the Church, Fallible; Make now the Inference. *Ergo* the *Protestants* Faith seem's more sound then the *Arians*, is a pure *Non-sequitur*, not at all Deducible from this Principle alone, nor indeed from any other.

*This Princ-  
ple concern's  
not Settlers,*

*More then  
the Arians,*

24. In the three following Paragraphs. 21. 22. 23. You haue only gross Mistakes, though if all were true, Protestancy has no aduantage by them. The Substance of all is thus. *If Divine Faith cannot be without an Infallible Assent, all other Infallibility (He means in the Proponent) is rendered vfeles.* Answ. Why so I beseech you? The Apostles Faith was certainly Infallible, did that render our Sauours Infallible Doctrin *Infally* proposed, vfeles? In like manner the Church teaches Infally, The Faithful Man elicits Infally Faith; grounded vpon Her Doctrin, Doth this make Her Teaching Vfeles? When the internal faith of euery Believer so necessarily depend's vpon an Infally Oracle, that none euer believed without some one or other, absolutely Infally.

*None can  
infer, if  
Faith be  
infally,*

*That there-  
fore an  
Infally  
Proponent of  
Faith, is  
unnecessary.*

25. But now *Ad rem*. Make hauocke of Faith as much as may be, Destroy Christian Religion, Say boldly (and falsly) the Roman Catholick Church both is, and euer was fallible. Say also, *Protestants, Arians, Pelagians*, and all the rest are fallible. Speak once to the Purpose and tell me (For here is the only

*Were all  
Proponents  
of Faith  
fallible,*

N n n n

doubt)

*The Protestants yet would not be in a better Condition then the Arion.*

doubt) Why should the Protestant with his fallible Faith, be in a better and a more Secure condition, than the fallible *Papist*, or the fallible *Arian*, with that faith they lay claim to? This the Doctor neuer meddles with, nor can the difficulty be solved by him.

*Though all were granted which the Doctor can rationally desire*

26. And Hence To rid my Selve of the rest, which folowes ( for really I am more weary of this Sport then the Dr<sup>r</sup> euer was at killing flies ) you shall Se with what Candor I Proceed. I freely permit the Doctor to make vse of all his following Principles, yea of the whole Thirty in Number, And say notwithstanding this ample Concession, He shall neuer Proue or infer from any of them, So much as One true Tenet peculiar to Protestants, which can be owned by these very men, that pretend to belieue Protestancy, *an Article of Faith necessary for saluation*. Here is my Reason. The General owned Truths ( as that a rational creature may antecedently to any External Reuelation, certainly know the Being of God &c ) no more belong to Protestants, than to others. The Doctors false Principles, as his 16. and 17. are, though Supposed true, euince nothing for Protestancy, as is already Proued. No more do his other Controuerted Principles; denyed by innumerable Christians, proue any thing. His obscure *Ones* ( and his 27 and 29. appear to me of the darker sort ) must be further explained, For truly I vnderstand not what is meant by those obscure words. Which restriction is no making Negative Articles of Faith, with the rest that followes. Be it how you will, thus much I defend, that, whether the fore mentioned Principles be True, False, Controuerted, or Obscure; no Verity peculiar to Protestants can be deduced from them, absolutely necessary to Saluation.

*Nothing, yet proued.*

*The reason heresof, brings Arguement.*

27. I Say deduced, either by lawful Consequences, or by the Addition of any received Principle, And I Speak thus, because Perhaps the Doctor may Answer, He intended no more at present, but only to set down some general Grounds, wherevpon Protestancy, by the ayde of further Proofs adioynable, though not as yet not made vse of, Can be established. If this

be



be his Reply, I Answer First. He has gone most lamely to work, leaving the whole Matter vndertaken, halfe done halfe yndone, in a word incompleat. I Answer. 2. There are neither Proofs nor Principles, to goe forward withall, I mean, whereby to Euince the truth of one *Pure Protestant Tenet*, held by *Sectaries themselves*, necessary to Saluation, And I coniure the Doctor (who must hold his abstract Principles hitherto laid forth, very imperfect) to aduance further, That is, to euince by some other more immediate Proofs, the absolute necessity of Belieuing one Protestant Article. This cannot be done.

*The Doctors whole work hitherto, most imperfect*

*He cannot goe on, and Compleat it*

28. The Reason why I Speak thus boldly, is the Verity hinted at in the beginning, and proued aboue. *Protestancy as Protestancy has no truth in it, No Essence of Religion, No One Article Conducing to Saluation.* And Hence it is, that the Doctor keep's off at distance, Or rather run's on as you se, partly by assuming false Principles against the Catholick Church; Partly with Generalities, which relate no more to Protestancy then to Ariannism.

*The ultimate ground of my Assertion*

*How differently the Catholick and Sectaries Proceed.*

29. Now here in passing you may well obserue The different Procedure of Catholicks, from Sectaries. The first tell you plainly what their Faith is. Besides the common Doctrin admitted by all Called Christians, They giue you in particular, a list of theer *Credenda*. The *Real Presence*, *Transubstantiation*, *Purgatory*, *Inuocation of Saints*, and in the first place, of the *Infalibility* of their Church, *peculiar to Catholicks only*. They moreover Assert, without the Beliefe of these Articles after a due Proposal made, none can be sau'd; And, here to omit other Probations, taken from Scripture, Councils, and Fathers, They ground their Beliefe vpon the Authority of God's own vniuersal euident Oracle, which hath taught the world from the Apostles Age.

30. The Sectary on the other side, neither dares nor Can name one Article, *Singular* to Protestants (Mark my words) Or Preach this Doctrin to any of his Hearers. *Such and such particular Articles, you are, as Protestants. Oblig'd to belieue, as most essen-*



692 Disc. 3. C. 18. *The Doctors Inferences null.*

*The Sectary  
cannot make  
one Pro-  
fane Article,  
Iudged by  
himself ne-  
cessary to Salu-  
ation*

*A possible  
Cauil an-  
swered.*

tial Tenents of our Religion, or will be damned, if you reject them; He cannot build one peculiar Protestant Article, vpon plain Scripture, vpon ancient Tradition, or any other received Principle, much lesse Proue its Truth by the Authority of a Church, which euer Shewed the Marks and Signatures of God's Infinite Power and Wisdom. It may be, Some Sectary will here Cauil at our Articles, and Say indeed, we plainly deliuer them, but needlessly multiply too many. If this be Obiected, I Answer first. The Assertion is no Principle, but a meer vnproued Supposition. I Answer. 2. in this place, it is an Impertinency, where we only vrge the Sectary to name but one Article, Iudged by him Essential to Protestancy and necessary for Saluation, As we plainly giue in our Seuerall necessary Articles. Thus much Comply'd with; We are as ready to Proue the Truth of our Catholick Positions, as to Euince vpon sound Principles, the Sectaries false and Improbable.

CHAP. XVIII.

*The Doctors Inferences, proued no Inferences, but  
vntrue Assertions. Having answer'd his Principles  
and Inferences, Satisfaction is required  
to some few Questions, here-  
after proposed.*

*The first  
Inference is  
a meer  
Tautology.*

1. **I**T followes, Saith the D<sup>r</sup> 1. There is no necessity at all of an Infallible Society of men, to assure men of the truth of those things, which they may be certain without &c. Answer. Here you haue neither Inference, nor Principle; (In very reallity neither true Consequence, nor Consequentia) No Inference; because, its a meer Tautology, or a bare repetition of what the Doctor had

had formerly asserted, without Proof or Probability, And consequently far enough from the Nature of either Principle or Inference. Had the Doctor brought in any thing like an Inference; He Should have said. Upon such and such grounds already established, it follows, that these and these particular Doctrins of Protestants are true, and immediately deduced from this or that Principle, But he totally abandon's the Protestants Faith, and leaves his Fellow-sectaries as faithless; as they were before he wrote these Principles. The True Inference therefore, or all that followes, is, that he hath lost his whole Labour.

what should be proved.

2. The. 2. Inference. The Infallibility of that Society of men, who call themselves the Catholick Church, must be examined by the same Faculties in Man, the same Rules of trial, the same Motives &c. Answ. Here is no Inference, but the same thing repeated again, which for the substance lies in his 6<sup>th</sup> Principle. Now if we Speak of this Doctrin considered in it Selfe, we easily grant, that the rational faculties in men, both may and ought to examin by the Light of prudent Motives, what Society of Christians is Infallible, as also what Divine Revelation is made evidently Credible to Reason. But herein a double Caution seem's necessary. The first. That Sectaries assume not to themselves, the sole Faculty of examining and judging, but leave to others a share of it also. The second *Principle* is, that Reason in this Search, go not beyond its Bounds, but pitch vpon that which is Reason's proper Object, I mean vpon those Signatures of God's own Visible Wonders, already explained. These two Conditions observed, All is well. Sectaries will soon Se their Errour.

yet no Inference.

what Reason is to examin

A twofold Caution is to be observed.

3. The. 3. Inference, deduced out of no Principle, falsely Supposes but proues not, the want of Miracles, and other conuincing Motives in Roman Catholick Church. It is, largely refused vpon several Occasions, in euery one of these three Discourses.

No want of Motives, and Miracles in the Church

4. The fourth Inference (From whence it comes, I know not)

N n n n 3

is

654 Disc. 3. C. 18. *The Doctors Inferences null.*

is thus. *The more absurd any Opinions are, and repugnant to the first Principles of Sense, and reason, which any Church obtrudes upon the Faith of men, The greater reason men will have, to reject the Pretence of Infallibility in that Church, as à grand impossure.* Answ. Had à Jew, who hold's it against Sense and Reason, to believe that God became an Infant; Or had an Arian that denyes the Trinity, because the Myſtery seem's repugnant to his weak Reason, Spoken after this manner, None would haue much wondred; But that à Doctor, who pretend's to believe these Fundamentals of Christian Religion, Cannot find roome enough in his head for *reason* and *Faith*, in euery particular the Church Teaches, argues some little want, both of the *One* and *Other*. But say on, what is it he boggles at? O, à Consecrated Wafer appear's to be bread, and is not bread, this is repugnant to sense and reason. Contra. Those two Angels that came to Lot. *Gen. 19.* appeared to the Sodomits like mortal men, but were not so: Was not Reason here, vpon the suggestion of Sense beguiled? And are not both these faculties now rectified in vs, by what we read in Holy Writ, which ascertain's vs they were not men but Angels? Thus it fall's out in the Myſtery of the Blessed Sacrament. Wherefore I Say, Were it not that God, Speaking by Scripture and the Church assures vs, that what we se, is not substantially bread, the whole world would (guided by outward Appearances) hold it bread, as those wicked Citizens iudged Lots entertained Guests to be men, and not Angels, But when eternal Truth interposes his Authority, and tell's vs by his own Oracles, what is here contained vnder the Forms of bread, is not bread, but Christs Sacred body; Reason yeilds vpon this most prudent Ground. *It is the highest reason in the world to believe God, though by reason we know not how things are.* Here is our Principle, not possibly to be reuerſed, vnless the Doctor proues his Contrary Doctrin by the Authority of another Scripture, or some other Church, more evidenced by Supernatural Wonders, and Conſequently more Orthodox, than the Roman Catholick Church is. You may read the First Discourse. C. 12. n. 4.

where

*A Speech  
like that of  
Iewes and  
Arians.*

*Sense begui-  
led.*

*How recti-  
fied?*

*God in this  
Myſtery  
interposes his  
Authority  
and vnbeguils  
reason.*

where its Proued, that the immediate Object of Sense Ceases not to be, in this Mystery.

5. Wherefore I Infer, that if the Doctor would haue the Infallibility of that Church reiected, as à grand Imposture, because it obrudes vpon vs Doctrins, in his Opinion repugnant to Sense and reason; He ought also by good Consequence, to Inuite both *Iesues* and *Arians*, to reiect the Infallibility of Scripture, as à grand Imposture, where it Speak's of the Incarnation, and the *Sacred Trinity*, for certainly these Mysteries, are far more aboue all Mens weak Reason, then this other of the Blessed Sacrament is.

*A hint gi-  
ued to Iesues  
and Arians,  
to reiect the  
Scriptures  
Infallibility.*

*True  
Assertions in  
place of  
Inferences.*

*No knowing  
what Scrip-  
ture Speaks,  
without an  
Infallible  
Church.*

*What's  
Contrary to  
Reason,*

*And What's  
aboue it?*

6. The Doctors 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> Inferences deserue no such names, because they are not deducible from any Principles, being only his own plain Assertions, and most untrue. Say I beseech you, From what Principles can He infer, *That to disown à Church which teaches Doctrin aboue the reach of weak Reason, is not to Question the Veracity of God, but to adhere to that, in what he hath revealed in Scripture?* How can this be done, Whilst the whole world see's, the holy Book of Scripture so variously Sensed by dissenting men called Christians, that none can conclude vpon any clear Principle, which sense is true, which false, without owing à Church Infallible? I Say, *aboue the reach of weak reason*, But not repugnant, as the Doctor supposes, For no Catholick Verity can be repugnant to Euident reason, though much aboue it. In à word. That Doctrin is *repugnant to Reason*, from whence two Contradictions clearly follow (now I yrge the Doctor to giue vs any thing like à Contradiction in the Mystery already mentioned of the blessed Sacrament) That Doctrin is *aboue Reason*, which cannot be known by the ayde of natural Principles only, And thus the Mystery of the Sacred Trinity, of the Incarnation, of Original sin, and Transubstantiation also, are so far remoued from our natural faculties, that none but God only, can discover them by his Supernatural Reuelation. The 6<sup>th</sup> Inference where the Doctor tell's vs, *That the Church of Rome, neither is the Catholick Church, nor any sound Part or member of it,*

it, is his own bare Assertion, already proved a loud Untruth.

7. Having now done with this List of Principles and Inferences, we may, I hope without offence, justly require the Doctors Express, direct, and Categorical Answer to these few following Questions.

*The first  
Question  
Proposed*

8. The first, and of main importance, though already plainly set down, may be thus. What that Essential revealed Doctrine is, now peculiar to Protestants, and held by them necessary to Salvation, which distinguishes that Religion as it is Protestant, from Popery, and all known Heresies? I speak of Doctrine indubitably revealed by Almighty God, or taught by any Universal Church, which these men own as a Truth peculiar to themselves; and necessary for Salvation. If a List of some such few Articles peculiar and necessary (mark my words) can without dispute be clearly given in, Protestants will highly advance their own Cause, and most easily point out some ancient Christians, that in former Ages believed as they do now. But Contrarywise, if not so much as one revealed Article of this nature, I mean peculiar to them, and in their Judgements necessary for Salvation, can be owned or laid claim to. It follows evidently, that Protestantism as Protestantism, is no Christian Religion, because in the whole Essence of it, you find not one truth revealed by Almighty God, or taught by any Universal Church.

*Not one  
Truth re-  
vealed by  
Almighty  
God, taught  
by Protes-  
tants, as  
Protestants.*

*Two De-  
mands  
more,*

*One concern-  
ing the  
ordination  
of the first  
Protestant  
Bishops.*

9. In the 1. place, Dr Scillingfleet who charges flat Idolatry upon the Roman Catholick Church, is desired to Answer Categorically to these two Demands. The first. If he acknowledge with Dr Bramhall and others, that the first Protestant Bishops received their Ordination from the Roman Catholick Bishops, or will assert with Luther, that the first Protestants had the Bible from the Catholick Church, My demand, I say is. Whether Mr Scillingfleet will roundly grant that the Protestant Bishops received their Ordination from Idolatrous Popish Prelates, or that Luther and Sectaries had their Bible from an Idolatrous Church? Affirm (and it must be granted) Mr Thorndicke in his last *Weights and Measures*. Page. 7. tells



plainly. If it be true (Viz. That the Papists are guilty of Idolatry) We cannot without renouncing Christianity; hold Communion with those, we charge with it. And what greater Communion Can there be then to take Orders from such Idolatrous Prelates, and the Bible from an Idolatrous Church? Again, in the Contents of the first Chapter, Mr Thorndicke add's. *They that Separate from the Church of Rome, as Idolaters, are thereby Schismatics before God.* This truth he proves very amply in the following Pages, And in the 7. P. now cited, Concludes thus. *So that, Should this Church declare, that the Change, which we call Reformation, is grounded upon the Supposition, to wit of Idolatry, I must then acknowledge, that we are the Schismatics.*

*Orders taken from Idolatrous Prelates, argues an ungodly Communion.*

*Mr Thorndicke's Indigments*

10. Moreouer, whereas the Doctor Charges the Church with Idolatry vpon this twofold account Chiefly, That She adores Christ in the blessed Eucharist, and allows the Veneration of holy Images, Mr Thorndicke. Chap. 19. in the Contents free's Her from both these Calumnies. *The worship of the Host in Papacy (saith he) is not Idolatry, and he Proves the truth in the Contents, because no Papist will acknowledge, that he honours the Accidents of bread, for God.* Again. *Reverencing of Images in Churches is not Idolatry.* Se the Probation hereof in his Page. 127. For it is not now my Intent to debate these Controuersies, but only to let the Reader know, how clearly the old Doctor (and I think the far more knowing man) Contradict's the younger, And this is done not in Matters disputable, or agitated in Schools, but in a Point of the highest Concern Imaginable touching the very essence of Religion. Wherefore he that Err's in a thing of such weight (vnless inuincible ignorance excuses, incur's God's Just Indignation, and Sin's damnably. If therefore Mr Thorndicke clear's the Church (were She guilty of Idolatry) from that Crime, He wrong's God, that hates Idolatry. But if our younger Doctor lais an Aspersion to abominable vpon the most ancient Mother Church, and thereby send's to Hell all his own Ancestors, with Millions and Millions of other Souls; T'is He, that draws God's heavy Iudgement vpon him, and for this loud

*Another Concerning worship and Adoration.*

*Two Doctors Contradict one another*

*The use of other of these Doctors is horrid Sinners,*

0000

Crying



638 Disc. 3. C. 18. *The Doctors Inferences null.*

Crying sin, besides Shame and Confusion, will haue many à sorrowful thought laid to his heart, before he dyes.

*A second demand, contains two things.*

*an open Contradiction.*

*A Turk err's not so far as he teacheth truth.*

*Idolatry makes Salvation impossible, though the Church teaches some truths.*

*The Doctors open Contradictions.*

*The Church can save her Children. She cannot save them*

11. My Second demand Proposed to the Doctor, includes these two things The first. Whether the Roman Catholick Church, which the Dr<sup>e</sup> expressly Saith, err's not against the Fundamentals of Faith; yet withall boldly auerr's, that She teaches Idolatry, be not à most open, plain, and manifest Contradiction? I Affirm it is. For to auerr on the one side, that She err's not in the Fundamentals of Faith, and on the other to say, she teaches Idolatry, which is à fundamental errour, is with one breath to affirm. She Err's, and err's not, in the fundamentals of Faith. One may reply, so far as the Church teaches truth, She err's not in fundamentals. Answ. No more doth à Turk who hold's one God, err in that, yet because the rest of his Religion is false, and destructive of Saluation, he can neuer get to Heauen by it. In like manner I Say, Though the Church teaches twenty fundamental Truths, yet if She spoil's all by maintaining one Point of Idolatry, Her Condition is damnable, and can no more bring any that belieues Her whole Doctrin to Heauen, then Mahometism can, which owns the Belieue of one God.

12. Hereupon you haue another manifest contradiction, and the Doctor shall neuer quit himselfe of it. In his Rational Account, He grant's à Possibility of Saluation to Catholicks, because they belieue in à Church sound (though not euery way safe) in fundamentals: Here again, he taxes Her with the horrid Sin of Idolatry, which most evidently makes Her Doctrin damnable, and Consequently Saluation impossible to those that belieue it; Therefore vnless these two Propositions which are Contradictory, be true. *There is à Possibility of Saluation in this Church to save Souls. There is no Possibility in it to save them*, the Doctors Assertions are as evidently Opposite to one another, as, if you should Say. *She can save soules; And she cannot save them*. Or, She is à true Church, and she is not à true Church.

13. A third Question. Whereas it is manifest and granted by Sec<sup>t</sup>aries, that the Roman Catholick Church once was confessedly

essedly Orthodox, at least for the first three or four Centuries, yet as our Aduersaries assert, failed afterward, and brought in strange new Doctrins, yea flat Idolatry. We urge the Doctor to satisfy Reason in this one particular. viz. Why Protestants deal not as Candidly with vs, as we do with them. I would say. We accuse them, for deserting a Church wherein their Progenitors had liued for a thousand years, and as a *little Method* lately published, observes excellently well, *speak open, and acknowledged Euidence*; We tell them who began this new Mode of Reformation, we exactly Point at the time of its first Rise, we Shew how it was Propagated, what Abettors it had, and omit no Circumstance, which may Conduce to a plain discovery of the whole Nouelty. Sectaries on the other side accuse the Church of *heretical*, yea of *Idolatrous* Innouations, and yet as the *Method* notes, their charge is so *obscure*, so utterly *unknown*, that the very Accusers cannot say, who first publish'd them, Or where they began; from what occasion they had their Origen? who patronized them? Or who opposed them?

A third  
Question  
grounded, on  
what Secta-  
ries grant

How plainly  
we deal  
with them,

And how  
darkly they  
with vs?

What the  
Doctor is  
obliged to,

we accuse  
and give up  
Euidence,

14. Please now to mark, what my demand is in this place. The Doctor and his Partizans suppose, these and the like wicked Innouations, of an *vbloodly Sacrifice*, of *Adoring the Sacred Host*, to have been evidently brought into the Church, Contrary to the Primitive Doctrin. For that publick act of *Adoration* came not in by night, but was a thing notoriously known, notoriously practized. Is not therefore the Dr obliged, either to tell vs plainly, *when*, *where*, and *how*, this visibible worship first began That is, to proue by *Euidence*, what He supposes *evidently innouated*, Or, to giue a reason; Why when Catholiks evidently proue the Sectaries reuolt from the Roman Church; Protestants cannot vpon *the like Euidence* Proue, that the Roman Church in latter Ages receded from any former Roman Church, pure and Orthodox? Obserue well the difference. We accuse them of an actual Reuolt from our Church, (whether they had reason for it or no, is not here disputed) The ground wherevpon our Accusation relies, is euident and notoriously known. They accuse as holdly as we do, But when their Proofs come to the Test, all of

660 Disc. 3. C. 18. *The Doctors Inferences null.*

*Sectaries  
accuse open  
guesses and  
false Suppo-  
sitions.*

*A Point  
worthy  
Reflection.*

*The Loyalty  
of the  
Church  
evidenced.*

*Of what  
poor Condi-  
tion her Ac-  
cusers are.*

*The im-  
peachment  
loud and  
criminal.*

*But Proofs  
answer not.*

*How the  
Doctor may  
gain  
applause.*

them dwindle into lame guesses, false Suppositions; in a word into à meer Nothing, as will better appear in the next Chapter.

15. Now here is à Point, I would haue every prudent Reader to reflect on, for I hold it à manifest Conuiction of our Sectaries open Injustice. If, whoeuer accuses à whole Kingdome (ever known loyal) of Treason against the Soueraign Power in it, ought to Produce no less then Euidēt Proofs in so weighty à Matter. Much more ought he or they, who impeach à whole ample Church of high Treason, plead by Euidence, or sit down Silent. The Loyalty of this Church to the most Supreme Soueraign *Christ Iesw*, is manifest. She hath, as is noted in the Other Treatise, dilated his Empire, defeated his Enemies (perfidious Heathens) gain'd him Friends, and innumerable Seruants. Her rep̄te was neuer yet stained by any, nor Fame blemished, but only by Infidels, Iewes, or known Hereticks. Now Start's vp à little late Knot of inconsiderable Sectaries, who both Cauil and accuse boldly, They impeach this Church of high Treason, For, She hath changed the true Doctrin of Christ, and in place of it taught, and yet teaches Plain Idolatry: She is therefore à Rebel against that King, whom She hath serued so long, and most faithfully. Here is à loud and euidēt Impeachment, an abhominable Treason laid to the charge of à Spouse, most euidently Loyal. But where are the Euidēt Proofs (answerable to this euidēt Accusation) against the already Loyal Euidenced Church? There are none so much as Probable, as shall be euinced in the following Chapter, where I positiuely proue, that Sectaries most iniuriously Calumniate the Church, without Law, without Authority, or any rational Argument.

16. If Doctor Stillingf. Shall please to return à plain Answer to what is here briefly proposed, as also to the rest which followes Concerning *this very point*, in the next Chapter, he will certainly gain the applause of à singular great Doctor, but if he Fob's vs off with his old Raillery of *killing Flies of Small Grains, Woolfacks*, and such like stuffe, the world will iudge (as to my knowledge many do already) *That He cannot Answer, For thus they Discourle and Methinks reasonably:*

ly : Had he not found himselfe more then à little in the briars, that is in plain language vnable to Answer such Arguments as are pressed vpon him, by thole two Authors he Slights, He would most indubitably before this day, haue replied to what is Obieced, without mispending time in publishing à triuial thread-bare *Cauil*, as is now done, Concerning the Idolatry of the Roman Catholick Church, which destroyes not only Catholick Religion, but Protestancy also, as is amply Proued in the 2. Disc. C. 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup>. In this wauiug of difficulties, and he is told about which they are, he bewrayes too much weaknes.

*The Dr bewrayes his weaknes in wauiug difficulties, which vrgs*

17. The fourth Demand is, and it will giue the Doctor some trouble. Suppose falsly, the Roman Catholick Church to haue brought in that abominable Sin of Idolatry many Ages before Luther, It is euident that when Luther and Protestants deserred Her, She was far (if Idolatrous) from being the pure Spouse of Christ, or any thing like an Orthodox Church in the very Fundamentals of Faith. Herevpon à great doubt Occurr's which ought to be cleared. It is. What other Church, neither Idolatrous nor notably erroneous, succeeded in the Place of this supposed Pestiferous erring Roman Society? Such à Church distinct from the Roman, free from Idolatry and gross Errour must be Pointed out, and plainly named, or it followes ineuitably that the world was then without à true Church.

*what Church succeeded in place of the Roman, Supposed Idolatrous?*

18. Perhaps the difficulty may yet be more significantly Proposed after this manner. When Luther revolted from the Roman Catholick Church infected, as is now imagined, with Idolatry and false Doctrin, There was then another Church in the world pure and Orthodox; Or not. If not; All our Sauiours Promises of being with the Church to the End of the world (He made no Promise of being with an Idolatrous, or any notorious erring Church) are false. Again, All that the Apostle writes. *Ephes. 14. 11.* of the Continuance of Pastors and Doctors in the work of the Ministry, for the edifying of Christ's Mystical body till we meete in one Vnity of Faith (most Certainly he Spake not of any deluded or Idolatrous Pastors)

*Christ's Promises made voyd, if there was no Orthodox Church in Being.*

*The Apostles words also, and*

662 Disc. 3. C. 18. *The Doctors Inferences null.*

*The Creed  
falsified*

are likewise vtterly false. Nay more, that Article of our Creed, *I beleue the Holy Catholick Church* ceased to be true in those dismal dayes, when the whole Roman Catholick Church made Idolatrous went to wrack, and the rest of Christians (if not Idolatrous) were all Professed Heretiques.

*What followes  
if then  
there was  
a true  
Church?*

*Luther and  
Protestants  
made a new  
Church.*

19. Contrarywise, if there was at that time another Orthodox Church in Being, when Luther Separated from the Roman Catholick Society; One of these two Consequences necessarily followes, Viz. That Luther and his Associates (the Protestants) either made themselves Members of that Imagined pure, Spotles, and Orthodox Church; Or founded a new One vpon their own Authority, neuer before heard of in the Christian world. Now further. It is most impossible to nominate any such Christians as Constituted a pure Orthodox Church distinct from the Roman Catholick, Therefore Luther and Protestants haue by their own Authority made a new One, neuer before known to the world.

*The Church,  
if Idolatrous  
err's in the  
fundamen-  
tals of Faith*

20. There is yet a third Inference which methinks pinches such Protestants as Say: They and we make but one Church Orthodox in fundamentals. How can this Doctrin stand, if the Roman Catholick Church teaches flat Idolatry? For vpon this Supposition She err's grossly in that fundamental Point of Idolatry, And consequently Protestants must either leaue her as horridly erroneous, or maintain Idolatry with Her. If it be replied though thus tainted, She yet teaches some few Truths, and Sectaries can exactly tell vs which and how many they are; They first argue vpon an improbable Supposition, and secondly make the louely Spouse of Christ, beautiful and vgly, treacherous and loyal, false and true together, whereof enough is sayd in the former Discourses.

*Sectaries  
improbable  
Supposition.*

21. The last question proposed, is, that the Doctor giue Satisfaction concerning the *Mission* of Protestants. In a word we demand who sent them to teach as they doe, *that the Roman Catholick Church is fallible and Idolatrous? That man hath no free Will? That the Body and blood of our Saviour are not really in the blessed Sacrament,*

*Sacrament*, with à number of other Nouelties? Our demand is grounded vpon the Apostles words. *Rom. 10. 15. How Shall they preach vnless they be sent.* Say therefore, who commissioned these men, who countenanced them to preach such Doctrins? Dare they tell vs, that as their English Bishops receiued Orders from the Supposed Idolatrous Catholick Prelates, So also they had Commission from them ( Idolatrous as they were) to teach Idolatry? Grant this and they make their Mission not only ridiculous, but null also, and vtterly void of Credit. Whither will they run next think ye? Can they pretend to haue had their Mission from the Arians, from the Hussits, or Waldenses &c? No certainly, For they teach not in all things as these Hereticks taught, And besides neuer receiued Commission from them, or from any men called Christians, to teach at all. Therefore they are vnsent Preachers and consequently in the Apostles Iudgement ought no more to be heard, than the Arians or Pelagians.

*A difficult Question Concerning the Mission of Sectaries.*

*They neuer had, nor can haue Commission to teach Protestantism.*

*The Assertion is proved.*

22. Some Sectaries tell vs, its needles' to Question their Mission, whilst the Testimony of the Spirit assures them that they teach the true Doctrin of *Iesus Christ*. Here is first à Supposition for à Proof, because The whole world, excepting themselves, deny what is now assumed, of their teaching truth. Howeuér, admit gratis this false Supposition, The meer speaking truth, giues them no Commission to teach it, For Children, Vagabonds, and Diuels also, may Speak eternal truths, yet are not therefore authorized to preach, or made Christ's lawful authorized Ministers. The Reason hereof seem's manifest. To preach truth is an effect of à lawful Mission, and not the cause of it, Wherefore this Causal or Inference, is good. I teach truth, because I am lawfully Commissioned to teach it, and exactly Comply with my Duty; Not the Contrary. I teach truth, therefore I am Authoritiuely sent to teach it.

*A reply answered.*

*To teach truth argues no Lawful Mission.*

23. By what is hitherto briefly noted, you se in what case Sectaries are, who first suppose à long interruption of Orthodox Pastors in the Roman Catholick Church, and consequently

*The desperate condition of Sectaries.*



664 Disc. 3. C. 18. *The Doctors Inferences null &c.*

No Church  
Orthodox or  
Heretical,  
sent them to  
teach.

quently neuer receiued Commission from them to teach, and though (which is true) they continued Orthodox, yet these Catholic Pastors neuer gaue them any Authority. Again, They scorn to receiue their Commission from known Hereticks, nor can they pretend it, because being in most Essential points opposite to Protestants, Such Hereticks could not impower them to teach Protestancy. For these Reasons Sectaries are obliged to renounce all claim to that Mission which is called *Ordinary*, because No Church, No Society of Christians, whether Orthodox or Heretical, sent these Nouellists abroad to teach as they do, their reformed Gospel.

Some with  
Luther lead  
à Mission  
Extraordi-  
nary

They haue  
neither ex-  
traordinary,  
nor Ordina-  
ry Mission.

24. Now if with Luther they challenge to themselves à Calling and Mission *extraordinary*; Not by men, or from men, but by the Reuelation of Christ Iesus, Their Plea no less Proofles then Presumptuous, is highly improbable vpon this ground, that neuer any since the beginning of Christianity was sent as *extraordinary* by Almighty God to preach, who made not his Doctrin *Credible* by manifest Supernatural wonders. So Christ our Lord did, and the Apostles also. Others that followed in the after Ages, laid forth the Miracles and signal Marks of the Church whereof they were Members, and euinced by Signs the Authority of that Oracle which sent them. But Sectaries who began with Luther to teach extraordinary Doctrin, neither plead by extraordinary wonders (hauing none to produce) nor can so much as hint at any Church, false or true, which commissioned them to publish Protestancy, Therefore they are vnlawful Ministers, neuer sent to preach Christ's true Doctrin, nor so much as their own false Nouelties of Protestantism.

CHAP.

## CHAP. XIX.

*The supposed grounds of our Protestants Reformation manifestly ouertbrown. Protestancy no Religion, but an improbable Nouelty.*

*The conclusion of this whole Treatise.*

1. I Say the *Supposed Grounds*, for in very truth Protestancy hath not any real Ground to Stand on, as is amply proued in the forecited Chapters, Howeu<sup>r</sup>, because Pretences are not wanting to such as Oppose God's verities, and our Aduersaries seem to build the whole Machin of their Reformation vpon one Principle Chiefly, we will here in the first place, Shew you what they pretend, and vtterly destroy it.

*What Selfa-  
ries pretend  
to ?*

*Vpon what  
they would  
build their  
Reformation*

2. In a word. The main ground of our Protestants late Reformation, or the Chiefest cause why they deserted the Roman Catholick Church, is best declared in their own language. The Roman Catholick Church (Say they) though once sound and Orthodox, yet in after Ages turned from God, betrayed his truths, brought in Idolatry and damnable Heresies. Hence it is we boldly accuse her, hence it is we write against her notorious Errours, and out of loue to our Souls leaue Her. *Non in sua diuina, Babylone Egredi*, Saith Riuet, in *Sum. Trac. 2. q. 2. n. 3*, We, by God's command are gone out of Babylon (he mean's the Roman Catholick Church) not so much for her vnpurities, as for Her Idols and Heresy. More he hath in the following words, often accusing this Church of Idolatry and Heresy. Consonant to

*The Protestants pre-  
tence said  
forth.*

*What Selfa-  
ries Affers*

Pppp

what

# 666 Dife. 3. C. 19. *Protestancy euinced improbable.*

what Mr Stillingsfleet teaches in the feveral passages of his Account.

*The ground  
of their  
Doctrin  
overthrowen,*

*by this one  
Sylogism.*

3. To overthrow this whole Plea, I Argue thus. Whoever evidently impeaches an ample Church of Idolatry or Heresy, once vniuersally acknowledged Orthodox, and proues not *evidently* the truth of his Acculation by clear and vnquestioned Principles, but desert's that Society without *Evidence* alleged against her Doctrin; *Acts most vniustly, Err's notoriously, and Sin's damnably.* But Protestants do So. That is, They evidently impeach a whole ample Church. (once vniuersally reputed Orthodox) of Idolatry and Heresy, and haue also most evidently deserted Her, without *Evidence* alleged against her Doctrin, which can be grounded vpon vnquestionable Principles, *Ergo, They act most vniustly, Err notoriously, and Sin damnably.*

*The Maior  
Proposition  
proued, and  
confirmed.*

*What if one  
discourse  
of Scripture,  
as Sectaries  
do of the  
Church?*

4. The Maior Proposition stand's firm vpon a Principle hinted at aboue. *Viz.* That an euident Accusation in so weighty a Matter utterly loses force, vnless euident Proofs support it. This may be further Confirmed by one Ratiocinations, in the like *Form of Arguing.* Whoever should evidently impute to Holy Scripture (once vniuersally received as God's Sacred word) *Idolatry* and *Heresy*, or so much as impeach it of slight and incredible Doctrin, as the *Machianellians* and *saciniens* do, without clear and *euidens* Proofs, would be a most desperate Plaintife, and Sin damnably, because he endeauours to bring into publick disreputation God's own truths, which the wisest of the world euer reuerenced as Sacred and Diuine. And though he should plead (as Sectaries Discourse of the Church) or Assert that the Book indeed was once pure and Orthodox, but afterwards falling into wicked hands, notorious Corruptions, false Doctrins (when or how no body knowes) clancularly got in, and spoild its purity; *Though I say,* He Should plead after this manner without a clear demonstration, or *Evidence* of Proofs, He would yet be a most vniust Accuser, and Sin damnably. *Ergo, He or they that tax a whole Church once owned for God's Spoule, and most certainly Orthodox, of notorious corrupted Doctrin* (with

(with an addition of Idolatry) are guilty of the very same open Injustice, and Sin damnably. The Parity holds exactly.

5. The Minor Proposition. viz. But *Secularies impeach* &c. Says two things. First, that they *evidently* accuse a whole Church, and haue evidently deserted Her, which is manifest *Ad uulm*. Secondly, that they haue done so without *Evidence* of Proofs against her Doctrine grounded on unquestionable Principles; And this we shall most easily demonstrate, if our Adversaries will please to own with vs these following Principles, or any of them, as most unquestionable.

*The minor  
Proved.*

6. First the plain and expresse words of Holy Scripture, without mixture of their particular Glosses, or surmises. 2. The unanimous Consent of ancient Fathers, but still without Glosses. 3. The clear iudgements of any Orthodox Church, whereunto we add the expresse Definitions of ancient approved Councils, and vniuersal Tradition received by all. 4. Manifest Reason. No Principles can be better, or equalize these in worth, Proofs if solid, must stand upon One, or more of them.

*Indubitable  
Principles  
supposed,  
where upon  
proofs must  
stand*

7 Speak therefore its high time. Let vs not eternally word it, but go closely to Work. We are here in a main Matter Concerning Salvation, can you Dr Scillingfleet, or any Protestant in England, as *Evidently* prove that such and such an Article of Catholick Religion is Contrary to all, or any one of these mentioned Principles, as every Grammarian can evidently tell you, that this or that Solecism is evidently against the Rules of Grammer? I here boldly challenge you; vouchsafe to Answer without tergiversation, if you can reioyn, you are worthy Doctors, if not; be pleased to surcease from writing Controversies hereafter. Yet one word more.

*Secularies are  
urged to fol-  
low closely  
the main  
point,*

8. You say *Evidently*, we are Idolaters, because we Adore Christ in the Blessed Sacrament. Hold on I beseech you, and proue your Evident Assertion *Evidently* by plain Scripture, by the unanimous consent of ancient Fathers, by the known iudgements of any Orthodox Church &c. When you pretend to haue done thus much (But begin you first) I'll boldly Confront you, and demonstrate, that the Scripture you allege is no Scripture, your supposed Fathers

*By Proofs  
drawn from  
the Priest.  
pls already  
mentioned*

# 668 Disc. 3. C. 19. *Protestancy euinced, improbable.*

*Sectaries  
Proofs meet  
Phantasies,*

are false Oracles, your supposed Councils, your Tradition, and lastly what you call *Reason*, merit not so much as the very *Names* you giue them. All this is to Say in other terms, You grossly abuse these Oracles, you either Corrupt their very words (as is most vsual) or violently force from them à new peruerse Sense, which God neuer intended to speak by them; And Consequently the Euidence you pretend to, is nothing But à strong Illusion, or au vngrounded Phansy, not resolvable into the *Clarity* or *Truth*, of any one of the forenamed Principles. Thus much premised.

*The minor  
Proposition  
proved*

9. I prove the *Minor* positiuely. If it be à manifest Truth, that Christ our Lord had an Orthodox Church on earth, for the last ten Centuries; If it be also manifest, that the Professors of this Church (be it yet where you will) were either Idolaters or damnable Hereticks, it is most demonstrable, that Sectaries cannot Euidently Euince the Roman Catholick Church guilty of Idolatry.

*Whoever  
proves the  
Roman  
Church Idol-  
atrous, euins  
Christ's true  
Church.*

10. The ground of my Assertion is. Whoever euidently proues the Roman Catholick Church guilty of Idolatry, euinces *eo ipso*, That Christ had no Orthodox Church on earth for à thousand years. To make this manifest, Please to diuide the whole Moral Body of men called Christians into three Classes, into *Orthodox Believers* (if yet there were any) into *Idolaters*, and known *Heretiques*. This Diuision made, I boldly Assert, you may iustly cast away that Class of *Orthodox Believers*, and call all rhe Christians in the world according to Sectaries, *Idolaters*, or known *professed Heretiques*. Catholicks you se, are listed amongst Idolaters, because they Adore Christ in the holy Eucharist, as the ancient Orthodox Græcians did; Those Græcians yet of the Schism, pray to Saints, that's plain Idolatry, Say Sectaries. The rest of Christians nameable the whole world ouer, from Luther to the third or fourth Age, (whether *Macedonians*, *Pelagians*, or *Arians*) were all professed Heretiques. These and none but these Imagined *Idolaters*, and known *Heretiques* (à Monstruous heteroclite Progeny of men) essentially constituted Christ's Orthodox

*The reason  
heretof.*

*The ancient  
and modern  
Græcians,  
supposed  
Idolaters*

thodox Church. Therefore he who proues Evidently, that Catholicks are Idolaters, and rightly *supposes*, All others called Christians to haue been Heretiques, *Proues* and rightly *Supposes*, Christ to haue had no Orthodox Church on earth for a thousand years, which is à desperate Improbability, deduced from our Sectaries Principle, who blush not to charge an ancient Church with that Shameful crime of Idolatry, though no Proof meanly probable (as we shall se hereafter) much lesse Euident, vphold's the Calumny.

*The rest were Hereticks*

*The inference clear, against Sectaries.*

*Why Evidence is required?*

*An Instance taken from Scripture proues what is required.*

*It is highly concern's all to defend the purity of Christ's Church, as the purity of God's word.*

11. Some may here demand, why we require to haue these supposed Errours and Idolatry of our Church evidently proued against vs? Is it not enough to euince this vpon moral Certainty? The First Question is easily answered, by proposing another of the like nature. Would not these Protestants iustly require Evidence from à new Sect of men, should it now start vp, and pretend on the one side to belieue in Christ, yet on the other, as boldly impute error and Idolatry to the holy Book of Scripture, as Sectaries do to the Church? They would certainly not be satisfied with lesser proofs then euident. Hence it is, that we in like manner, exact neither Topicks, nor guessees, but clear Evidence against the supposed errors of our Church; and reasonably do so, First because, She by God's Special Prouidence, hath hitherto preserved Scriptures pure, without Corruptions in Doctrin. 2. Because all must own Scripture as both Diuine and pure, vpon the Authority of Christ's Church. Therefore it as highly concern's Christians, to maintain the purity of Christ's Church, as to maintain the purity of Scripture, And Consequently, if nothing lesse then Evidence can bring that Sacred Book into contempt, or Euince it of error, Nothing lesse then Evidence can cast à blemish on the Church, which giues vs Scripture, and ascertain's all, that it is Diuine.

12. That other Pretence to moral Certainty is à meer whimsy reiected aboue in the second Discourse. The Reason there hinted at, much to this sense, Conuinceth. A Doctrin in Matters of Religion Contrary to the Publick Iudgement of the whole



670 Disc 3. C. 19. *Protestancy eninced, improbable.*

*The pretence  
to Moral  
Certainty  
refused.*

*A Doctrin  
Contrary to  
the publick  
Iudgement  
of the world,*

*Cannot be  
Morally  
certain.*

*What may  
well be cal-  
led this pu-  
blick Iud-  
gement?*

*The Instan-  
ces concer-  
ning Scrip-  
ture, intro-  
duced again.*

*That Sacred  
Book cannot  
be iustly ca-  
lumniated*

*whilst a  
whole  
Church  
defend's its  
purity.*

Christian world, cannot be morally Certain, But what Sectaries Assert Concerning the Errours and Idolatry of the Church, is a Doctrin Contrary to the publick Iudgement of the whole Christian world, Ergo. I proue the *Minor*. One great part of the Christian world, is the Roman Catholick Church, She stily opposes this loud Calumny of Idolatry and errours laid to Her Charge. Add herevnto the Sentiment of the Chiefest, and the most known Arch-heretiques, Who, whilst they were in their wits, that is, before their wicked Apostasy, Iudged as the Church Iudged, and believed as she believed. This Vniuersal Consent of an Euidenced Church, together with the Sentiment of Her once Orthodox Members (though afterward wilful Reuolters) I call a Iudgement of Christians *so publick*, and vndoubted, that nothing Contrary to it can be morally Certain. Giue me but one Instance of any Truth reputed Morally certain amongst men, which euer merited that name, when witnesses so vniuersal, so numerous, and well qualified opposed it, and I shall acquiesce, But this is impossible.

13. Here again fitly comes in, what we now Sayd of Holy Scripture. Suppose which is true, that your Chiefest Arch-hereticks once reuerenced that sacred Book as God's Divine word, with the same high respect as the Roman Catholick Church euer did, and yet doth. Suppose. 2. That Some Abettors of those first wicked men, whether *Arians*, *Socinians*, or *Others*, should begin to charge the Book with false Doctrin, would such a supposed Calumny, thinke ye; euer arriue to so high Moral Certainty, as to bring Scripture into open Contempt, whilst a whole learned Church defend's its purity? No the Calumny would not be meanly probable vpon this Ground, that neither Probability (much less Moral Certainty) can stand in force, when Witnesses of so great worth, so vniuersal, and numerous oppose it. Apply what is here noted to the Church, and you will find an exact Parity. Both She and her own Arch-aduersaries, once maintained Her Doctrin as Sacred, and Orthodox, Now rise vp a Company of iarring Sectaries, who will, forsooth, haue their Charge

Charge of Idolatry and notorious Errours againſt Her, paſſe for à *Moral certain Truth*, The Aſſertion cannot arriue to moral certainty before the whole Body of Chriſtians becomes mad, and makes Scripture it ſelfe, no leſſe an erroneous Book than the Church Idolatrous, For here is my Principle. With one moſt certain Aſſent, I hold the Church inerrable, and the Scriptures Diuine: Deſtroy the Churches infallibility, or Say ſhe hath erred, you make Scripture *ex ipſo*, à Book of no credit.

14. A. ſecond Argument. Thoſe who exactly follow the ſtrain of all old condemned Heretiques, and as wickedly implead the Roman Catholick Church of error, are vpon that account like them, that is, guilty of horrid Sin and Hereſy. But Proteſtants do ſo, Ergo they are guilty of horrid Sin, and Hereſy. The *Major* is vnqueſtionable, For if our Modern Sectaries exactly cloſe with the mode of all condemned Heretiques, it followes that as thoſe firſt Apoſtates for their malice, were guilty of Hereſy, ſo alſo theſe latter are.

15. The *Minor* is eaſily proued. Your ancient Heretiques accuſed as boldly the Roman Church then in Being of error, as our modern Sectaries do the preſent Church. They rebelled againſt it, and deſerted it, ſo do our Proteſtants. They ſought to reform it, ſo would our Proteſtants. For example. The Arians were as earneſt to reform the Churches Doctrin concerning the *Conſubſtantiality* of the Son with his Eternal Father; The Pelagians as buſy, to cancel Original ſin; The Donatiſts as Zealous to perſwade men, that the *true Church* was not vniuerſally extended; as euer Proteſtants were earneſt, buſy, and Zealous, to haue this preſent Church reformed in her Doctrins of *Tranſubſtantiation*, of *Adoring the Sacred Hoſt*, praying to *Saints*, And what els you will. Now I Subſume.

16. But all theſe Accuſers, all theſe rebellious Reformers (as like, as like can be to one another) are wicked, and ayme at the Ruin of Chriſts true Church, *which is Manifeſt*, For had euery one of them done what they deſired, or reformed according to their Capricious humours, There had not been at this day

*No more can  
à few iav-  
ring Advan-  
saries juſtly  
Calumniate  
the Church*

*A ſecond  
Argument,  
taken from  
the procedu-  
re of old  
Condemned  
Hereticks.*

*Our Secta-  
ries accuſe  
like them,  
rebel, and  
would  
reform as  
they did.*

*Therefore  
their ſin and  
Apoſtaſy,  
the very  
ſame.*

*Beauſe all  
tend to the  
deſtruction  
of Chriſts  
true Church.*

672 Disc. 3. C. 19. *Protestancy euinced, improbable.*

*A difficult  
question  
proposed.*

day any Orthodox Church in the world. Now here in my Question which certainly deserues à candid Answer. If all Heretiques, ancient and Modern reform the Church according to their particular Sentiments, most evidently Christs true Church is destroyed. Why therefore should I or any, if we were yet to seek à better Religion, rather adhere to the Reformation of à *fallible Protestant*, than to that other, of à *fallible Arian*, or à *Pelagian*? You Shall haue à Strange Answer.

*Our Secta-  
ries Answer,  
is an vnpro-  
uoued Suppo-  
sition,*

*And con-  
tain's no-  
thing but  
what  
your old  
Heretiques  
taught them  
to speak.*

17 We are told, when the Arians went about to reform, the Church was pure, but now Her known corruptions force Sectaries, out of true loue to their Souls (at least) to reform themselves, If the Church will learn Her duty by their good example, She may, if not; She must remain in her errorrs. Answ. Is not this more then ridiculous? First to make an vnproued Supposition their Proof, and then to say nothing, but what both the Arians and other Heretiques haue put in their mouths, and taught them to speak. For did not these wicked men pretend as dear loue to their Souls? Did they not Clamour as loud against the Churches imagined errorrs in those ancient dayes, as euer Protestants haue done in these latter? Say therefore why should the Protestants Reformation be esteemed more secure, and Orthodox, than what the Arians endeauored to, introduce? It will be hard to Answer, whilst this Principle stand's firm. *If all reform, the Church is ruined.*

*Another  
Reply exa-  
mined.*

*Sectaries are  
urged to  
pitch vpon  
Some parti-  
cular con-  
trouersy*

18. Some may Reply. Protestants without all doubt (who haue diuorced themselves from the Chnrch) therefore clamour so loud, because they haue strong Proofs at hand, whereby to euince that, that once faithfull oracle, is now guilty of notorious errorrs, which no Arian could then do. Answ. Here is the main Point I would willingly be at, and haue examined to the bottom. I therefore press these Nouellists to pitch vpon some one particular Controuersy (*Transubstantiation*, for example, or this now debated point of Idolatry, in adoring the Consecrated Host) and vrge them first, to Argue by the plain words of Holy Scripture. When all they can Say is said, I will demonstrate, that

that the Arians produce Passages of holy Scripture far more significant (might we rest in the meer sound of words) for their Heresy, than ever Protestant alleged against *Transubstantiation*, or any other Catholick Tenet. 'Tis true, your Arians make little account of any Authority but what seems to them plain Scripture, or appears deducible from Scripture (and this was the old Protestant way) But our Newer men have some respect to the Consent of Fathers, and an ancient Church: These, we presse to dispute closely in *Form* and to make our supposed errors, or their Contrary pretended truths known, by virtue of any one received Principle. It is Answered, thus much is done in their Books already set forth. We Reply. All their Objections hitherto proposed, have been as fully and clearly solved, as either they or we, solve the Arguments of Atheists against God, and the Jewes *Cauils* against Christ. Or, if they have any new ones yet in store, which require further satisfaction, it is certainly most easy to propose them in good Form. This done, I will engage, they shall no sooner appear in publick, then have a full and satisfactory refutation.

19. We are told again, such and such Books published by Protestants have not been answered, As if forsooth, all Books set forth by Catholicks were refuted. In a word here you have all. It is very true, the *Cauils*, The *leers*, and *indious length* of some books have not been answered, with the like *Cauils*, *leers*, and *length*, But what is this to our purpose, whilst we urge for Arguments, whereby it may appear to a disinterested Judgement, that Catholicks have forsaken the ancient Orthodox Faith, And that Protestants now lately had the singular Priviledge of setting Religion right on its old firm foundations? All Arguments hitherto proposed of this nature, or which tend to infringe any particular Catholick Doctrine, have been dissolved and torn in pieces, over and over. Or, if, as I now find, there yet remain any unanswered, our Adversaries may vouchsafe to let vs. hear them.

20. *Secularies* reply. We have indeed offered to solve

Q 999

their

The point of  
Doubt in  
Scripture,  
more plain  
for Arians  
than for  
Protestants.

Secularies  
Objections  
hitherto  
proposed  
have been  
solved.

Secularies  
pretences of  
Books not  
answered,  
revelled.

What hath  
been answered  
by Catholicks  
what they  
say.

# 674 Disc. 3. C. 19. *Protestancy euinced, improbable.*

*An other  
plea of  
fallacies*

their Obiections, as also to attaque Protestancy with many Arguments; but as our Solutions are slight, so our Arguments against them seem light and forceles. Call me to mind one or two only.

*Arguments  
undervalued  
by them, as  
forceles*

*Though  
most Con-  
vincing.*

*Of Sectaries  
unreasona-  
ble appeal to  
Scripture  
alone.*

*Their un-  
reasonable  
preceding  
declared by  
one instance.*

*This Dis-  
course  
driven  
home, and  
applied to  
these two  
disting-  
uishing  
Parties.*

21. They haue been told, If the Roman Catholick Church be fallible, and Protestants as fallible, Tewes and Gentils may iustly Scorn Christianity, when they se a fallible Protestant attempt to settle an erring Papist in the right way to Saluation, or a fallible Papist to do the like on an erring Protestant, whilst neither the one nor other can know *infallibly, which is the right way to Saluation.* They haue been told. 2. To make Scripture *alone* the sole Rule or Iudge in Controuersies, encreases the Scorn of these Aliens from Christ, who hold it more then ridiculous, to appeal to a Iudge for the Decision of their doubts, when none of them after the appeal made, can Certainly know what the Iudge Speaks, or this Rule of Scripture regulates. What I say is manifest, for So various and discordant are all these in their Interpretations of God's word, that the Arians auouch it Speaks *Arianism*, Protestants *Protestanism*, Papists *Papery*, Pelagians *Pelagianism*, and so of the rest. Imagin I beseech you, that two who accuse one another of high Treason Should come before a Iudge and desire to haue the final sentence pronounced against the Criminal person. (Both I suppose are not guilty) The Iudge speaks once, and no more, but these two at discord agree not about the main point, which is the true meaning of his Sentence, may not Both return home as wise as they came, and contend till Dooms Day, vnless some other Iudge break's off the quarrel, and sayes plainly. *Thou art the Traitour?*

22. This is our very case, either we or Protestants betray Gods truths, The one or other Party Contradict's the first Verity, and boldly auerres, *he Speaks what he never Spake.* We appeal to Holy Scripture and would haue our Debates decided by that Oracle, Two or three Passages (*He that hears you hears me. The Church is the Pillar and ground of Truth. He that hears not the Church, let him be as a Heathen &c.*) literally taken, denote the guilty Party,

But



But our Sectaries tell vs, we mistake the Scriptures meaning. They vary from vs in the main Point concerning the very Sense of our Iudges Sentence, Is it not therefore euident, that they must either recurre to some other Tribunal for à final decision, or Secondly ingenuously Confesse, they are the men, who will not haue the traitorous Party discovered, Or lastly acknowledge, Controuerxies can haue no End, and that God has not left any means on earth, whereby the notorious Deprauers of his reuealed Truths may be known? One only Instance will giue more light to what I haue sayd.

*Sectaries  
cast them-  
selves into in-  
extricable  
difficulties*

23. We and Sectaries appeal to Christs sacred words. *This is my Body.* We vnderstand them literally and strongly plead our cause alleging for vs, not only the Authority of the western and eastern Churches, but, (if need were) of the Lutherans also, They reiect all, yea Say, we grossly mistake the sense of Christs words, and therefore hold vs the Traitours that commit grosse Idolatry, in the sight of God and Angels. Consider good Reader, are not such Aduersaries obliged to plead their Cause before this *Iudge of Scripture* by à Church as vniversal, by witnesses as Faithful, by an Authority as great, as we produce against them, or to confesse ingeniously, This Controuerxy cannot be decided. They may, 'Tis true Oppose the Calvinists to Lutherans, but to denote à Church either Latin or Greek, that maintained their Opinion of the Eucharist, Shall neuer be made so much as meanly Probable. O yes, the Primitiue Church taught as they teach. *Contra.* Its vtterly vntrue, as is largely proued in the first Discourse. Again that's à thng yet in Controuerxy, and therefore far from being à manifest sentence against vs, yet their Clamours against our Idolatry are manifest, and as iniurious as manifest.

*what diffi-  
rent senses  
are made of  
Christs words?*

*How the  
Catholick  
pleads?*

*Sectaries  
allege no-  
thing for  
their Sense*

24. These, and yet far more forceable Arguments proposed by Catholick Authors against Protestancy, our Aduersaries call *These Small Grains, gnawing of Rats &c.* We wholly Contrary hold them conuincing, and the cause we defend most iust. Here both Parties Sick in the hight of their heats, Stiffe in their ways, without yeilding



676 Disc. 3. C. 19. *Protestancy eninced, improbable.*

to one another. Is it not therefore full time, and reasonable think ye to appeal to some Iudge *distinct from Scripture*, by whose just Sentence it may appear, whether we old Papists, or our young Nouellists are the guilty men, that impiously oppose Gods truths?

25. You se whilst the sense of Scripture and Fathers is not agreed on, we are advanced no further but only to quarrel, as if Contention were the final end of *winning Controversies*. Or as if an eternal Debate were desired and after that to have nothing decided. For this sole Reason, A Iudge is absolutely necessary, though our Adversaries will hear of none, having an honour to admit of any Churches Iudgement, whereby the cause now in debate may be happily ended. Yet if we follow the Rule of Reason, what can be more Satisfactory then to appeal to Church Authority in this weighty matter? We Catholicks stand to the Sentence of our own evidenced, vniuersal Church, She is our Iudge. Are not Sectaries therefore obliged (if their Arguments against vs be thought solid, and their cause good) to appeal to the Iudgement of some other Church, as evidenced by Miracles and as vniuersal as ours is, which once taught as they teach, and publickly decryed our supposed Errours?

26. What we now propose seem's reasonable, because Protestants most certainly (as they defend Protestantism) will not pretend to publish a Doctrin (with a strict obligation laid on their Paritans to acquiesce in it.) which no Orthodox Church ever taught, or if any Church ever taught so. This must be as clearly evidenced, as it is evident, that the Roman Catholick Church taught Popery, seven or eight Ages since. Here in a word is the true trial of their whole Cause. Denote, Point out, or name an Orthodox Church which owned this Protestancy since six Centuries since. Controversies are ended; But if it be (as it is) most impossible to name such a Church, The Abettors of Protestancy only follow the strain and Method of all Condemned Hereticks, and proue themselves by their own procedure Heretiques. That is, They plead against Catholick Doctrin, by

*false*

*A Iudge  
distinct from  
Scripture  
proves a  
false necessity  
17.*

*Contention  
is not the  
last end of  
winning  
Controversies*

*Catholicks  
appeal to  
our Iudge*

*Protestants  
are forced to  
appeal to  
another of  
equal Au-  
thority, or  
their Cause  
is lost.*

*They cannot  
pretend to  
publish a  
Doctrin,  
which no  
ancient  
Church ever  
taught.*

*Sectaries  
proue them-  
selves here-  
tiques.*

*False Calumnies, weak Canons, lame coniectures, vnscand Scriptures, and abused Fathers, without any Church Authority to rely on, And thus all your ancient Heretiques haue Proceeded:*

27. Wherefore to conclude I Say in a word. Protestancy is a most improbable Religion, or to speak more plainly, no Religion at all. The ground of my Assertion will be best laid forth in these few words. No ancient vniuersal Church, no Orthodox Christians in any part of the world, euer taught Protestancy, Ergo its improbable. Nay more; no Heretical Society of men euer taught that whole Doctrin, Therefore it is an vnpatronized Nouelty, reiectcd by the Vniuersal Christian world, whether Orthodox, or others. And Hence it is, that whatever Protestants can Say in behalfe of their own Tenets, or Contrary to Catholick Doctrin, comes to no more but to improbable and vnproued Suppositions. Obserue I beseech you:

28. They tell vs the Roman Catholick Church once true, deserted the Ancient Faith, we vrge them to proue the Assertion, and with good reason, because neither ancient Church, nor any sound Christian euer said so before themselves. And what Answer haue we? The very Calumny without more; and their own vnproued Suppositions, serue both for proof and Answer. We demand Again, when, or in what Age the Church became thus accursed and traitorous to Christ? They forb vs off with fooleries, of beards growing Gray, and weeds peeping vp in a garden imperceptibly. Is not thy ridiculous? We Aske 3. Seing the world was neuer Since the Apostles preached without an Orthodox Christian Society, what other pure Church succeeded in place of the Roman now supposed Idolatrous, and heretical? None hitherto has offered to answer this Question, nor can it be Answered, vnless Sectaries admit two or three distinct different Churches. The first Primitiue and pure, the second corrupted which came in when the Roman Catholick began her supposed Idolatry, The third again pure and spotless, which closely followed the Roman fallen into Error, And this is a meer chimera. We lastly demand why this Protestant Reformation, should be

Q999 3

more.

*Calumnies, their only Despay.*

*Protestancy proued an Improbable Religion.*

*The ground of our Assertion.*

*Improbable Suppositions, the only Proofs of Sectaries.*

*Questions proposed, when the Church failed?*

*What other pure Church succeeded in place of Roman man supposed?*

*How many different Churches will Sectaries admit?*

678 Disc 3. C. 19. *Protestancy eninced, improbable.*

*Why Should  
the Prote-  
stants Refor-  
mation be  
better, then  
that of the  
Arians?*

*For one  
weighty  
reason is it  
far worse.*

*The impro-  
bability of  
Protestan-  
tism further  
declared,  
in a very  
unequal  
Parallel.  
The first re-  
uerenced the  
other scorn'd  
The one hath  
a head, the  
other is  
headles.  
Tradition  
teach the  
one fancy  
the other  
The one saw  
and was  
diffused, the  
other hid in  
corners.  
Councils  
and no  
Councils,  
Unity and  
Divisions*

more lik'd, more look'd on, or held any wayes better, then those precedent Reformatiōs of their elder Brethern the *Dona-  
tists*, or Others? Will it be said Protestants came after the rest, or in the last place, and therefore think themselves more skilful, the only gifted men in this business of mending Religion? Plead thus, I answer, They speak improbably, and are worse then all their Predecessors vpon this very account, that hauing seen the Malice, the weak Attempts, the vn lucky sucresse of defeated Heretiques in former Ages, will not learn by such woful examples to be more wise and wary, then to run the Risque with them, and thereby to incurr God's heavy Indignation.

29. Whoeuer desires to make à further inspection into that high improbability, which other Christians Charge Protestancy with, may please to compare à little our Catholick Religion with this other late risen Nouelty. If things be well weigh'd ( without Controuersy so euidēt that they need no Proof) The first will be found alwayes reuerenced, and neuer oppos'd by Orthodox Christians; Contrarywise, the other will appear an obiect of scorn, not only to the wisest of the world, but also to innumerable that professe it against their own Consciences. The One, hath an Ecclesiastical Head for its Guide; The other is an vngouernable Body without head, or ioynts to tye its iarring parts together. The One shewes you manifest and most euidēt Miracles, The other (if euer nature wrought Miracles) à Miraculous boldnes to deny the greatest wonders, God hath wrought by the Church. The One teaches what it anciēdly receiued, by à neuer interrupted Tradition; The other what is suggested by euery Priuate Phansy. The one is diffused the whole world ouer, The other only Creeps vp and down in a few Corners of these Northern parts, in so much that some Religious Orders are further extended than Protestancy. The One hath had feuerall Oëcumenical learned Councils; The other neuer any, learned or vlearned. The one still retain's à strict vniy in Faith, the other manifestly is torn in pieces with Diuisions

sions. The one giues you à large Catalogue of its ancient visible Pastors, and visible professors, for full Sixteen Ages. The other cannot name one Protestant Village, nor one Protestant man, before the dayes of the vnfortunate Luther.

*visible Pa-  
stors and in-  
visible,  
Compared  
together*

30. The one hold's its Catholick deceased Ancestors worthy respect and veneration, The other makes them all besotted Idolaters, and worse then mad men. The one Religion Stand's firmly built vpon plain Scripture, and the Authority of an euident vniuersal Church; The other vtterly vnprincip'd, has not one word of Holy writ for it, nor either vniuersal or particular Church, which euer taught Protestancy. The one has à Mysterious Bible and à certain Interpreter, the other à meer body without à Soul, the bare letter without life, words without sense, and Phansy to Interpret. The one resolues its faith into God's infallible Reuelation, the other has nothing like Faith to resolue. The one Religion Proues its truths Infallible, The other seek's for fallible Doctrin, and has found enough of what is both fallible, and false also. An Ancient Possession vphold's the One, and à publick iniurious rebellion against the Mother Church giues the other all the Right it hath. The Professors of the one, proue God to haue been the Author of it, who yet preserues it vnalterable and pure by Diuine Assistance. The Professors of the other say plainly that God neuer reuealed one Article of their *reformed Protestancy*, and therefore need no Diuine Assistance to preserue it. The Professors of the One, shew you à Church gloriously marked with Signes and Wonders (peculiar effects of God's Infinite Power and Wisdome) which make the Religion *evidently Credible* to Reason. The Professors of the other, in lieu of such Marks, Shew you à bare *Naked Nothing*, without Miracles, without Conuerfions, without austerity, or any thing that appear's like à work of God in it, and therefore is most euidently incredible.

*Respect and  
à high  
dishonour*

*Principles  
and no  
Principles  
An Inter-  
preter and  
no Interpre-  
ter  
Faith and  
no faith  
Infallibility,  
and fallibi-  
lity, à  
An ancient  
Possession,  
an open  
wrong,  
Diuine  
Assistance,  
and no Di-  
uine Assi-  
stance*

*A glorious  
euidenced  
Church, and  
a meer Na-  
ked Nothing,  
parallel'd,*

31. Thus much for an Essay only which might be further enlarged, but its needles, for you haue euery particular proued in the Treatise here in your hands. If our Aduersaries hold  
them

680 Disc. 3. C. 19. *Protestancy evinced, improbable.*

*Bob's re-  
quired, if  
our Adver-  
saries hold  
their Cause  
wronged?*

themselves or cause injured, whilst we so highly extol the one Religion, and extenuate the other to Improbability, it will, methinks, be very easy to right Bob, by shewing plainly (upon sound and very sound Principles) wherein our mistakes lie, or in what substantial Matter we have errod. But still remember Principles.

*The sole End  
why we pro-  
pose this.*

*We exhort  
with Blessed  
S. Austin.*

32. What I here propose Seem's reasonable, and 'tis done for this sole end (Almighty God knowes) that after our long Debates, it may at last appear to every one, on which side Truth stand's. Now if vpon so faire an Offer we have nothing return'd, but Sectaries wonted Strain of Cavils, trim'd up with pretty teers. I, for my part, have done and shall in place of Arguing further, mildly exhort as Blessed S. Austin once did in a like Occasion. *De Unit. Ecclesia. C. 19. fine. Si autem non patescit, quod tam iuste à vobis flagitamus, ostendere. Creditis veritati, Convince, Obdormiscite à futuro, expurgamini ad salutem.* If you, Sectaries, cannot Convince our Church guilty of error, by undeniable Principles (this we iustly require), *Believe Truth.* Let your weak Attempts and fury sleep, Surocase from this frivolous charging vs with Heresy, and Idolatry. You know, Gentlemen, you know full well, we are no Idolaters, your own Consciences tell you your Plea is naught, your Cause undeniable. *Expurgamini ad salutem.* Wake, open your drowly eyes, and look about you.

*And appeal  
to their own  
guilty Con-  
sciences.*

*Aspers'd long  
drowly sleep  
is time to  
wake.*

33. You se our Noble England set on fire by your vntfortunate dissentions concerning Religion, bring your teares to quench the flames. You se your Selues vpon your different Engagements (some brain-lick with Fanaticism, some with no man knowes what) worrying one another, Wonder nothing, it must needs be so, whilst you are out of the peaceable Fold of Christ's vnit'd Church. You have been too long Prodigal Children straying from the house of God, return with a hearty *Pecuni*, A tender Mother (the Catholick Church) is willing to receive you, and a good old Father, Christ's Vicar vpon earth, as ready to embrace you with open arms.

arm  
cious  
and  
Athe  
para  
and  
to C  
vigil  
wake  
My  
may  
and  
one

armes. You se Atheism enters, and is rise among you; pernicious *Leviathans*, and other like Monsters range vp and down, and poyson innumerable. How Should it be otherwise? Atheism followes vpon what you haue done, For those who Separate from the true Church, soon Separate from Christ also, and cannot after that double Diuorce, long Continue Friends to God. Wherefore once more *Expergiscimini ad salutem*, be vigilant. *Hora est iam nos de somno surgere*, it now high time to wake. Your Concern is no less a Matter then eternal Saluation. My earnest prayer is, that Christ our Lord, the *Light of the World*, may break through the thick cloudes of all darken'd hearts, and with the radiant beams of Diuine Grace illuminate euery one, *Ad salutem*, to endles Bliss and Happines.

*The Authors  
heartly wish,*

F I N I S.